PART II

The Manuscript of the Vajracchedikā Found at Gilgit

An Annotated Transcription and Translation

by Gregory Schopen

Table of Contents to Part II

ABBREVIATIONS AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbreviations and Special Transcriptions Used in the Edition and Textual Notes

Chak: Chakravarti 1956.

Cz: Conze 1974.

Du: Dutt 1959.

G: Gilgit Manuscript. Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra, eds. *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts (Facsimile Edition).* Pt. 7. Śata-Piṭaka Series 10(7). New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1974, folio 1380–93. I have also been able to use—thanks to Professor J. W. de Jong—a printout of a microfilm of the manuscript. This printout is sometimes much easier to read than the published facsimile.

Ku: Kumārajīva's Chinese translation of the *Vajracchedikā.* Taishō 235. *Chin-kang pan-jo po-lo-mi ching.* Vol. 8, 748–52. The very few references I make to this text are all taken from Conze's notes to his edition.

MM: Müller 1881.

MS: manuscript; the same as G.

Par: Pargiter 1916.

Tib: Tibetan Translation. *'Phags pa shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa rdo rje gcod pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo.* Peking Kanjur. Otani Reprint, vol. 21, no. 739. *Photographic Reprint of the Tibetan Tripitaka.* Kyoto: Tibetan Tripitaka Research Institute, 1958, 250-5-2 to 256-3-8.

ṇ̆ : The transcription of an akṣara which looks like the akṣara for *–ṇa–* with a mark above it very like the vowel marker for *e.* This mark is clearly intended as a kind of *virāma,* although the value of the nasal is not always clear. This akṣara, when it appears, always occurs as a

word final, and often seems to be used interchangeably with *anusvāra*.

w. : wrongly. This implies no judgment with regard to the "correctness" or "incorrectness" of the grammatical form, etc. It refers only to the readings actually found in the MS and whether or not they have been accurately given by the editors.

· : represents a similar mark of punctuation found in the MS.

)) : represents a similar mark of punctuation found in the MS.

·)) : represents a similar mark of punctuation found in the MS.

( ) : indistinct or damaged akṣaras.

[ ] : lost or unreadable akṣaras.

x : lost or unreadable akṣaras within a word.

Abbreviations and Bibliography

Aalto, Pentti. 1968. "Conditionals in Buddhist Sanskrit." *Studies in South, East, and Central Asia*. Śata-Piṭaka Series: Indo-Asian Literatures, vol. 74. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1–9.

BHSD: Franklin Edgerton. *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953.

BHSG: Franklin Edgerton. *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953.

Chakravarti, N. P. 1956. "The Gilgit Text of the Vajracchedikā." In Giuseppe Tucci, ed., *Minor Buddhist Texts*. Serie Orientale Roma IX.1. Rome: IsMEO, 175–92.

Conze, Edward. 1948. "Remarks on a Pāla Ms. in the Bodleian Library." *Oriental Art* 1.1: 9–12. Reprint. Edward Conze, *Further Buddhist Studies*. Oxford: Bruno Cassirer, 1975: 116–24.

———. 1962. *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Aṣṭādaśasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā, chaps. 55 to 70*. Serie Orientale Roma XXVI. Rome: IsMEO.

———. 1973. *The Short Prajñāpāramitā Texts*. London: Luzac and Co.

———. 1974. *Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā.* 2d ed. Serie Orientale Roma XIII. Rome: IsMEO. Cited by page number.

Coomaraswamy, Ananda K. 1977. "Saṁvega: Aesthetic Shock." Reprint. In Roger Lipsey, ed., *Coomaraswamy, 1: Selected Papers: Traditional Art and Symbolism.* Bollingen Series, no. 89. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 179–85.

de Harlez, Charles. 1891. "Vajracchedikā (Prajñāpāramitā) traduite du texte sanscrit avec comparaison des versions chinoise et mandchoue." *Journal Asiatique* (8th series) 18.

Demiéville, Paul. 1937. "Butsudo." In *Hōbōgirin.* 3d fasc. Paris: Librarie d'Amérique et d'Orient Adrien Maisonneuve, 198–203.

Dīgha-Nikāya. Edited by Thomas W. Rhys Davids and Joseph E. Carpenter. 3 vols. London: Pali Text Society, 1890–1911.

Dutt, Nalinaksha, ed. 1959. *Gilgit Manuscripts.* Vol. IV. Calcutta: J. C. Sarkhel/Calcutta Oriental Press. Reprint. Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica 24. Delhi: Sri Satguru, 1984, 139–70.

ed.: edited, editor, edition.

f./ff.: and following.

Filliozat, Jean. 1980. "Sur le domaine sémantique de puṇya." In *Indianisme et Bouddhisme: Mélanges offerts à Mgr. Étienne Lamotte.* Louvain-la-Neuve: Institut Orientaliste, Université Catholique de Louvain.

fo.: folio.

Hara Minoru. 1967–68. "Transfer of Merit." *The Adyar Library Bulletin,* nos. 31–32. Dr. V. Raghavan Felicitation Volume, 382–411.

———. 1970. "Tapo-dhana." *Acta Asiatica* 19: 58–76.

Ingalls, Daniel H. H. 1962. "Cynics and Pāśupatas: The Seeking of Dishonor." *The Harvard Theological Review* 55: 281–98.

Kern, Hendrik and Nanjio Bunyiu. 1908–12. *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka.* Bibliotheca Buddhica 10. St. Petersburg: Imperial Academy of Sciences. Reprint. Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag, 1970.

La Vallée Poussin, Louis de. 1923–31. *L'Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu.* Paris: Paul Guethner. Reprint. Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques, vol. 16. Brussels: Institut Belge des Hautes Études Chinoises, 1971.

Lamotte, Étienne. 1962. *L'Enseignement de Vimalakīrti*. Bibliothèque du Muséon, tome 51. Louvain: Publications Universitaires/Institut Orientaliste.

Lorenzen, David N. 1972. *The Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Masuda Jiryō. 1930. "Saptaśatikā Prajñāpāramitā." *Taishō Daigaku Gakuhō* 6-7.

Müller, F. Max. 1881. *Buddhist Texts from Japan*. Anecdota Oxoniensia: Aryan Series, vol. 1, pt. 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 19-46.

Pargiter, F. E. 1916. "Vajracchedikā in the Original Sanskrit." In A. F. Rudolf Hoernle, ed., *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature Found in Eastern Turkestan*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 176-95.

Roerich, George. 1959. *Biography of Dharmasvāmin*. Historical Research Series 2. Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute.

Rowell, Teresina. 1934-37. "The Background and Early Use of the Buddhakṣetra Concept." *The Eastern Buddhist* 6.3 (1934): 199-246; 6.4 (1935): 379-431; 7.2 (1937): 131-76.

Schopen, Gregory. 1975. "The Phrase '*sa pṛthīvipradeśaś caityabhūto bhavet*' in the *Vajracchedikā*: Notes on the Cult of the Book in Mahāyāna." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 17: 147-81.

Vaidya, P. L. 1960. *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*. Buddhist Sanskrit Texts, no. 4. Darbhanga: The Mithila Institute.

Waldschmidt, Ernst. 1967. "Der Buddha preist die Verehrungswürdigkeit seiner Reliquien: Sondertext I des Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra." In Ernst Waldschmidt, *Von Ceylon bis Turfan*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Walleser, Max. 1914. *Prajñāpāramitā. Die Vollkommenheit der Erkenntnis*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs.

Warder, A[nthony] K. 1971. "Dharmas and Data." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 1: 272-95.

Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary. Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1961.

Yuyama Akira. 1967. *Indic Manuscripts and Chinese Blockprints (Non-Chinese Texts) of the Oriental Collection of the Australian National University Library, Canberra*. Occasional Paper, no. 6. Canberra: Centre of Oriental Studies, Australian National University.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE*

Since the Gilgit manuscript of the *Vajracchedikā* has already been edited twice, the reasons for another edition may not be altogether apparent. There are, however, several good reasons for a reedition. First of all, the manuscript of the *Vajracchedikā*—which contains in addition three other texts—is one of the most carefully written of the Gilgit finds. In the introduction to his edition Chakravarti, for example, notes with regard specifically to the text of the *Vajracchedikā* that the manuscript "is remarkably free from errors.... The few mistakes which occur are mainly orthographical or are due to oversight."[1] The Gilgit text of the *Vajracchedikā* is, in fact, a fine example of what a *Prajñāpāramitā* text in Sanskrit prose actually looked like in the sixth or seventh century, as opposed to how we—under the watchful eye of Pāṇini and the influence of the expectations derived from much later, mostly Nepalese, manuscript traditions—might think it should have looked. In consequence the manuscript has considerable significance for the history of the "style" of this literature, as well as for the history of the language *as it was actually written*. This is especially so in regard to syntax and the use of sandhi and sandhi forms.

But, if all of this is true, then it is of some importance to have as accurate an edition of the manuscript as is possible, and this brings us to a second good reason for making another edition of the text: both of the previous editions are full of mistakes and distortions. Since all of these will be signaled in my notes, there is no reason to cite them here and we might simply note the broad types of errors that occur in the editions.

In Chakravarti's edition, for example, in less than ten pages of romanized Sanskrit there are at least twenty-nine cases in which the manuscript has, correctly, a long vowel, which Chakravarti reads or prints, incorrectly, as a short vowel. There are at least seven cases in which the opposite occurs, that is, what in the manuscript is, correctly, a short vowel is printed in Chakravarti's edition, incorrectly, as a long

*The initial work for this text edition and translation was made possible by a grant from the Translations Program of the National Endowment for the Humanities, an independent federal agency.

vowel (virtually all of these mistakes occur at the ends of words and involve case endings, gender and number distinctions, etc.). There are at least six cases in which the manuscript has, correctly, a plural verb form, but in which Chakravarti prints, incorrectly, a singular. There are at least thirty-two cases in which Chakravarti omits an *anusvāra* found in the manuscript, printing an *–m* instead, and at least nine places where Chakravarti's edition omits entire words which are found in the manuscript. Although I know very well from experience that some mistakes are always made in working from manuscripts, this, I think, is a little excessive.

Dutt's edition is equally problematic and gives an equally distorted impression of the manuscript. He, for example, completely misrepresents the sandhi found in the manuscript. There are at least thirty-seven cases in which a perfectly correct sandhi in the manuscript is printed by Dutt as an unresolved hiatus (*–y* + *a–* printed as *–i a–* eight times; *–e–* printed *–a i–* five times; *–ā–* printed as *–a a–* ten times; *–ai–* printed as *–a e–* four times; *–o–* printed as *–a u–* seven times, etc.). His treatment of *anusvāra* and the nasals is equally problematic. In addition to this, there are five places where he adds words—once a whole line—which are not found in the manuscript, four places where he omits words—again, in one case a whole line—which occur in the manuscript, and in four more places he brackets words which actually occur in the manuscript.

There are yet other reasons for undertaking a new edition of the Gilgit text. Its appearance might serve to stimulate a badly needed critical investigation and revision of other editions of the text. The edition of the late Edward Conze, for instance, has become the standard one, and has recently been reprinted. Yet it is of very dubious value from a text-critical point of view. Conze's edition, for example, is badly conflated. He mixes texts of clearly different recensions and widely different dates, and does so with a high degree of arbitrariness. He says in his introduction that the text he wants to present "is substantially that of Max Müller" which "is based on three documents, all comparatively late."[2] But at 14b, for example, he reads *na mama bhagavan duṣkaram. Duṣkaram* is not the reading in any of Müller's three sources, the Gilgit text or the Tibetan translation. All of these sources read *āścaryam* (*ngo mtshar*). In spite of this, and without any stated justification, Conze adopts the reading found in Pargiter's Central Asian manuscript (which is probably a thousand years earlier than the manuscripts on which Conze's basic text is based) and the "reading" found in Kumārajīva's translation. This, of course, is not a terribly significant example, but it is typical of one aspect of Conze's methodology. We might look at another

case which underscores even more clearly the arbitrary nature of Conze's editorial procedures. At the end of his 17c he omits an entire passage which is found in Müller's edition (i.e., Conze's basic text), because it is not found in Kumārajīva, Pargiter or the Tibetan text. It is also not found in the Gilgit text (although Conze fails to note this) and therefore we can "infer," he says, that it "is a later addition which has crept into the text after 800 A.D."[3] He also adds that "it is also doctrinally suspect ... contradicting the whole of Buddhist tradition" and, he says elsewhere, "the idea is contrary to the tradition of the Prajñāpāramitā."[4] Obviously, if each editor were allowed to exclude passages which contradicted what he thought was "the whole of Buddhist tradition" or "the tradition of the Prajñāpāramitā," the resulting text would be little more than a personal document. If, on the other hand, Conze excludes the passage primarily on the grounds that it does not occur in Kumārajīva, Pargiter, the Tibetan and Gilgit texts, then he must also exclude passages like *evaṁ parityajan gaṅgānadīvālukāsamān kalpāṁs tān ātmabhāvān parityajet* at 13e, *'grayānasaṁprasthitānāṁ sattvānāṁ arthāya śreṣṭhayānasaṁprasthitānāṁ arthāya* at 14a or any number of other passages, each of which is omitted in all four sources.

In regard more specifically to the Gilgit text it should be noted that Conze's notes to his edition reproduce all the errors in Chakravarti's edition, and that there are a number of cases in which Conze's notations in regard to the Gilgit text are wrong or misleading. For example, at 15b he notes that *na-abodhisattva-pratijñaiḥ sattvaiḥ śakyam ayaṁ dharmaparyāyaḥ* is missing in the Tibetan translation, but he does not note that it is also missing in the Gilgit text. Clearly, then, the text established by Professor Conze can only be used with the greatest circumspection, and a new critical edition is badly needed. The discovery of three new manuscripts of the *Vajracchedikā* in Nepal makes such an edition even more desirable.[5]

Given the fact that the Gilgit manuscript of the *Vajracchedikā* represents both an early and a well-written text, and given the fact that one of my primary purposes is to provide a readily available example of what a *Prajñāpāramitā* text in the sixth or seventh century actually looked like, I have chosen to present, not an edition of the manuscript, but a transcription. I have added a series of notes—in the most economical way possible—signaling the errors and silent alterations which appear in Chakravarti's and Dutt's editions. I have offered virtually no emendations, conjectures or "corrections." The text stands almost exactly as it occurs in the manuscript. This is true of the punctuation as well. I have simply reproduced the punctuation found in the manuscript, which is, I might add, usually good. I have added no grammatical or syn-

tactical notes, although there are things of interest which fall into both categories, nor have I catalogued sandhi forms. I have, in fact, done very little except try to present as accurately as possible the text as it is found in the manuscript.

In presenting the transcription I have, for the sake of economy, not used footnoting or footnote numbers. I first give the transcription of the folios line by line. The second section of the article consists of a series of notes for each line of each folio indicating the misreadings and errors concerning that line found in the published editions. The word or words in my transcription that have been wrongly read or printed by Chakravarti, Dutt, etc., are signaled in these notes by bold face type, and they are followed by statements giving the reading found in Chakravarti, Dutt, etc.

In addition to the transcription and notes, I have provided a translation. The translation is included for two basic reasons: first, to allow those who cannot read Sanskrit, but who are interested in the text, to be able to see what an early version of this text looked like and, second, because I think, rightly or wrongly, that the available English translations of this text can be usefully supplemented by another interpretation. That, in the end, is what every translation is. The first of these reasons has also very largely determined the kind of translation I have given. Apart from having paraphrased some recurring rhetorical phrases, I have tried, in the main, to stay as close to the text as possible. This procedure has, I hope, preserved some of the "style" of the original. It has, I know, resulted in what might most politely be called a "Sanskritic" English. I can here only repeat the words of an obscure scholar writing some years ago: "In reference to the translation given here, it should be noted first that it was not intended to be beautiful. In this, I am afraid, I have succeeded beyond even my greatest expectations."

I have added to the translation a few notes, especially where there are textual uncertainties or where I thought a particular point needed further interpretation. The notes are obviously incomplete and clearly reflect my own particular interests.

TRANSCRIPTION OF THE GILGIT TEXT

Folio 5a (G 1380; Chak 182.1-183.11; Du 151.3-152.15; MM 29.6-30.11; Cz 38.6-39.20; Par 182.10-183.10; Tib 253.1.3-2.5)

1. -taḥ bhagavān āha · yā(vat) subhūt(e) tr(i)sāhasra-mahāsāhasre lokadhātau pṛthivīrajaḥ kaccit tad vahu · āha · bahu bhagavan tat pṛthivīrajaḥ arajas tathāgatena bhāṣitas tenocyate pṛthivī-
2. -raja iti · yo 'py asau lokadhātur adhātuḥ sa tathāgatena bhāṣitas tenocyate lokadhātur iti ·)) bhagavān āha · tat kiṁ manyase subhūte dvātṛṁśatā mahāpuruṣalakṣaṇais tathāgato draṣṭavyaḥ
3. āha · no bhagavaṁs tat kasya heto tāni tāni dvātriṁśan mahā-puruṣalakṣaṇāni tathāgatena bhāṣitāny alakṣaṇāni tenocyante dvātriṁśan mahāpuruṣalakṣaṇānīti · bhagavān āha · yaś ca kha-
4. -lu pu(na)ḥ subhūte strī vā puruṣo vā gaṁgānadībālukopamān ātmabhāvān parityajed yaś ceto dharmaparyāyād antaśaś catuṣ-padikām api gāthām udgṛhya parebhyo deśayed ayam e-
5. -va tato nidānaṁ bahupuṇyaṁ prasavetāprameyam asaṁkhyeyaṁ)) atha khalv āyuṣmāṁ subhūtir dharmapravegenāsrūṇi prāmuṁcat so 'srūṇi prāmṛjya bhagavantam etad av(o)cat ā-
6. -ścaryaṁ bhagavan paramāścaryaṁ sugata · yāvad ayaṁ dharma-paryāyas tathāgatena bhāṣito yato me bhagavaṁ jñānam utpannaṁ na me jātv ayaṁ dharmaparyāyaḥ śrūtapūrvaḥ paramena
7. (t)e (bhaga)van(n) āścaryena samanvāgatā bhaviṣyanti ya iha sūtre bhāṣyamāṇe bhūtasaṁjñām utpādayiṣyanti · yā caiṣā bhagavan bhūtasaṁjñā saivāx-ṁ(j)-x-ā xsmāt tathāgato bhāṣate

Folio 5b (G 1381; Chak 183.12–184.9; Du 152.15–154.11; MM 30.12–32.1; Cz 39.20–41.19; Par 183.10–184.20; Tib 253.2.5–3.8)

1. (bh)ūxxx(bh)ūtasaṁjñeti · na me bhagavann āścaryaṁ yad aham imaṁ dharmaparyāyaṁ bhāṣyamāṇam avakalpayāmy adhimucya· ye te bhagavan satvā imaṁ dharmaparyāya(m) u(d)gra(h)īṣya(n)ti · yāva(t pa)ryavāpsya–
2. –nti · te paramāścaryasamanvāgatā bhaviṣyanti · api tu khalu punar bhagavan na teṣām ātmasaṁjñā pravartsyate · na satvasaṁjñā na jīvasaṁjñā na pudgalasaṁjñā · tat kasya hetoḥ sarvasaṁjñā(pagatā hi)
3. buddhā bhagavantaḥ bhagavān āha · evam etat subhūte paramāścaryasamanvāgatās te bhaviṣyanti ya imaṁ dharmaparyāyaṁ śrutvā nottrasiṣyanti · na saṁtrasiṣyanti · na sa(ṁ)trā(sam āpatsya–)
4. –nte · tat kasya hetoḥ paramapāramiteyaṁ subhūte tathāgatena bhāṣitā · yāṁ ca tathāgataḥ paramapāramitāṁ bhāṣate · tām aparimāṇā buddhā bhagavanto bhāṣante · te(n)oc(yate) pa–
5. –ramapāramiteti ·)) api tu khalu punaḥ subhūte ya tathāgatasya kṣāntipāramitā saivāpāramitā · tat kasya hetoḥ yadā subhūte kalirājāṅgapratyaṁgamāṁsāny acchaitsīt nāsī–
6. –n me tasmin samaye ātmasaṁjñā vā satvasaṁjñā vā jīvasaṁjñā vā pudgalasaṁjñā vā · vyāpādasaṁjñā vāpi me tasmin samaye 'bhaviṣyad abhijānāmy ahaṁ subhūte atīte 'dhvani paṁca jātiśa–
7. –tāni yo 'haṁ kṣāntivādī ṛṣir abhūvaṁs tatrāpi me nātmasaṁjñābhūn na satvasaṁjñā na jīvasaṁjñā na pudgalasaṁjñā · tasmāt tarhi subhūte bodhisatvena mahāsatvena sarvasaṁjñā varjayitvā

Folio 7a (G 1382; Chak 184.9–185.4; Du 156.14–157.13; MM 34.2–35.2; Cz 44.6–45.11; Par 186.11–187.7; Tib 253.5.7–254.1.7)

1. –rimāṇena · sarve te satvā mamāṁsena bodhiṁ dhārayiṣyanti · tat kasya hetoḥ na hi śakyaṁ subhūte ayaṁ dharmaparyāyo hīnādhimuktikaiḥ satvaiḥ śrotuṁ · nātmadṛṣṭikair na satvajīvapu–
2. –dgaladṛṣṭikaiḥ śakyaṁ śrotuṁ udgrahītuṁ vā · yāvat paryavāptuṁ vā nedaṁ sthānaṁ vidyate · api tu khalu punaḥ subhūte yatra pṛthivīpradeśe idaṁ sūtraṁ prakāśayiṣyati · pūjanīyaḥ sa

3. pṛthivīpradeśo bhaviṣyati · sadevamānuṣāsurasya lokasya vandanīyaḥ pradakṣiṇīkaraṇīyaś caityabhūta sa pṛthivīpradeśo bhaviṣyati · ye te subhūte kulaputrā
4. vā kuladuhitaro vā · imān evaṁrūpān sūtrāntān udgrahīṣyanti yāvat paryavāpsyanti · te paribhūtā bhaviṣyanti suparibhūtāḥ yāni ca teṣāṁ satvānāṁ pūrvajanmikāny aśubhāni ka-
5. -rmāṇy apāyasaṁvartanīyāni tāni dṛṣṭa eva dharme paribhūtatayā kṣapayiṣyanti buddabodhiṁ cānuprāpsyanti · abhijānāmy ahaṁ subhūte atīte 'dhvany asaṁ(khy)e(y)ai(ḥ) kalpai(r) (a)saṁkhyeya-
6. -tarair ddīpaṁkarasya tathāgatasyārhataḥ samyaksaṁbuddhasya pareṇa caturaśītir buddhakoṭīniyutaśatasahasrāṇy abhūvan yāni mayā ārāgitāni ārāgya ca na virāgitāni ·

Folio 7b (G 1383; Chak 185.4-27; Du 157.13-159.2; MM 35.2-36.3; Cz 45.11-47.5; Par 187.7-deest; Tib 254.1.7-2.6)

1. yac ca mayā subhūte te buddhā bhagavanta ārāgya na virāgitā yac ca carime kāle paścimāyāṁ paṁcāśatyāṁ varttamānāyām imāṁ sūtrāntān udgrahīṣyanti · yāvat paryavāpsyanti · asya subhū-
2. -te puṇyaskandhasyāsau pūrvakaḥ puṇyaskandhaḥ śatatamīm api kalān nopaiti · sahasratamīm api · śatasahasratamīm api · saṁkhyām api kalām api gaṇanām apy upamām apy upa-
3. -niśām api na kṣamate · sacet subhūte teṣāṁ kulaputrāṇāṁ kuladuhitrīṇāṁ ca puṇyaskandhaṁ bhāṣeyaṁ yāvantas te satvā kulaputrāḥ kuladuhitaraś ca tasmin samaye puṇya-
4. -skandhaṁ parigrahīṣyanti · unmādaṁ satvā anuprāpnuyuś cittavikṣepaṁ vā gaccheyuḥ api tu khalu punaḥ subhūte acintyo 'yaṁ dharmaparyāyaḥ asyācintya eva vipākaḥ))
5. āha · kathaṁ bhagavan bodhisatvayānasaṁprasthitena sthātavyaṁ kathaṁ pratipattavyaṁ kathaṁ cittaṁ pragṛhītavyaṁ · bhagavān āha · iha subhūte bodhisatvayānasaṁprasthitenaivaṁ cittam utpā-
6. -dayitavyaṁ sarvasatvā mayā anupadhiśeṣe nirvāṇadhātau parinirvāpayitavyāḥ evaṁ ca satvān parinirvāpya na kaścit satvaḥ parinirvāpito bhavati · tat kasya hetoḥ sace-

Folio 8a (G 1384; Chak 185.27-186.22; Du 159.2-160.10; MM 36.3-37.16; Cz 47.5-49.5; Par deest-188.10; Tib 254.2.6-4.4)

1. -t subhūte bodhisatvasya satvasaṁjñā pravartteta · jīvasaṁjñā pudgalasaṁjñā vā na sa bodhisatva iti vaktavyaḥ tat kasya hetoḥ nāsti subhūte sa dharmo yo bodhisatvayānasaṁprasthito nāma · tat kiṁ manya-
2. -se subhūte asti sa kaścid dharmo yas tathāgatena dīpaṁkarasya tathāgatasyāntikād anuttarāṁ samyaksaṁbodhim abhisaṁbuddhaḥ āha · nāsti sa bhagavan kaścid dharmo yas tathāgatena dīpaṁkara-
3. -sya tathāgatasyāntikād anuttarā samyaksaṁbodhim abhisaṁbuddhaḥ āha · tasmād ahaṁ dīpaṁkareṇa tathāgatena vyākṛto bhaviṣyasi tvaṁ māṇavānāgate 'dhvani śākyamunir nāma tathā-
4. -gato 'rhan samyaksaṁbuddhas tat kasya hetos tathāgata iti subhūte tathatāyā etad adhivacanaṁ yaḥ kaścit subhūte evaṁ vadet tathāgatenānuttarā samyaksaṁbodhir abhisaṁbuddheti ·
5. nāsti subhūte sa kaścid dharmo yas tathāgatenānuttarā samyaksaṁbodhir abhisaṁbuddhaḥ yaḥ subhūte tathāgatena dharmo 'bhisaṁbuddhas tatra na satyaṁ na mṛṣāḥ tasmāt tathāgato bhāṣate · sarva-
6. -dharmā buddhadharmā iti · sarvadharmā iti subhūte sarve te adharmās tenocyante sarvadharmā iti ·)) tadyathāpi nāma subhūte puruṣo bhaved upetakāyo mahākāyaḥ subhūtir āha · yo

Folio 8b (G 1385; 186.22-187.15; Du 160.10-162.1; MM 37.16-39.2; Cz 49.5-50.14; Par 188.10-189.9; Tib 254.4.4-255.1.1)

1. 'sau tathāgatena puruṣo bhāṣita upetakāyo mahākāyaḥ akāyaḥ sa bhagavaṁs tathāgatena bhāṣitas tenocyate upetakāyo mahākāyaḥ bhagavān āha · evam etat subhūte
2. yo bodhisatva evaṁ vaded ahaṁ satvān parinirvāpayiṣyāmīti · na sa bodhisatva iti vaktavyaḥ tat kasya hetoḥ asti subhūte sa kaścid dharmo yo bodhisatvo nāma · āha · no hīdaṁ bha-
3. -gavan bhagavān āha · tasmāt tathāgato bhāṣate niḥsatvāḥ sarvadharmāḥ nirjīvā niṣpudgalāḥ yaḥ subhūte bodhisatva evaṁ vaded ahaṁ kṣetravyūhān niṣpādayiṣyāmīti · so 'pi tathaiva

4. vaktavyaḥ tat kasya hetoḥ kṣetravyūhāḥ kṣetravyūhā iti subhūte avyūhās te tathāgatena bhāṣitās tenocyante kṣetravyūhā iti · yaḥ subhūte bodhisatvo nirātmāno dharmā nirā-

5. -tmāno dharmā ity adhimucyate sa tathāgatenārhatā samyaksaṁbuddhena bodhisatvo bodhisatva ity ā(khyāta)s tat kiṁ manyase subhūte saṁvidyate tathāgatasya māṁsacakṣuḥ āha · evam etad bha-

6. -gavan saṁvidyate tathāgatasya māṁsacakṣuḥ)) bhagavān āha · tat kiṁ manyase subhūte saṁvidyate tathāgatasya divyaṁ cakṣuḥ prajñā(ca)kṣur dharmacakṣur buddhacakṣuḥ āhaivam etad bhagavan saṁvidyate ta-

Folio 9a (G 1386; Chak 187.14–188.7; Du 162.1–163.5; MM 39.2–40.8; Cz 50.14–52.14; Par 189.10–190.7; Tib 255.1.1–2.1)

1. -thāgatasya divyaṁ cakṣuḥ prajñācakṣur dharmacakṣur buddhacakṣuḥ)) bhagavān āha · tat kiṁ manyase subhūte yāvantyo gaṁgānadyāṁ bālukās tāvantya gaṁgānadyo bhaveyus tāsu yā bālukās tāvanta eva lo-

2. -kadhātavo bhaveyuḥ kaccid bahavas te lokadhātavo bhaveyuḥ bhagavān āha · yāvantaḥ subhūte teṣu lokadhātuṣu satvās teṣām ahaṁ nānābhāvāṁ cittadhārāṁ jānīyās tat kasya heto-

3. -ś cittadhārā cittadhārā iti subhūte adhārās tās tathāgatena bhāṣitās tenocyante cittadhārā iti · tat kasya hetor atītaṁ subhūte cittaṁ nopalabhyate · anāgataṁ cittaṁ nopalabhya-

4. -te · pratyutpannaṁ nopalabhyate · tat kiṁ manyase subhūte ya imaṁ trisāhasramahāsāhasraṁ lokadhātuṁ saptaratnaparipūrṇaṁ kṛtvā dānan dadyād api nu sa kulaputro vā kuladu-

5. -hitā vā tato nidānaṁ bahu puṇyaṁ prasaveta · āha · bahu bhagavan bahu sugata · bhagavān āha · evam etat subhūte evam etad vahu sa kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā tato nidānaṁ

6. bahu puṇyaṁ prasaveta · sacet subhūte puṇyaskandho 'bhaviṣyan na tathāgato 'bhāṣiṣyat puṇyaskandhaḥ puṇyaskandha iti · tat kiṁ manyase subhūte rūpakāyapariniṣpattyā tathāgato dra-

Folio 9b (G 1387; Chak 188.8–189.21; Du 163.5–164.9; MM 40.8–41.9; Cz 52.14–54.1; Par 190.7–191.7; Tib 255.2.1–3.3)

1. -ṣṭavyaḥ āha · no bhagavan na rūpakāyapariniṣpattyā tathāgato draṣṭavyaḥ tat kasya hetoḥ rūpakāyapariniṣpattī rūpakāyapariniṣpattir ity apariniṣpattir eṣā tathāga-
2. -tena bhāṣitā tenocyate rūpakāyapariniṣpattir iti · bhagavān āha · tat kiṁ manyase subhūte lakṣaṇasaṁpadā tathāgato draṣṭavyaḥ āha · no bhagavan na lakṣaṇasaṁpadā tathāgato
3. draṣṭavyaḥ tat kasya hetoḥ yaiṣā lakṣaṇasaṁpat tathāgatena bhāṣitā alakṣaṇasaṁpad eṣā tathāgatena bhāṣitā tenocyate lakṣaṇasaṁpad iti · bhagavān āha · tat kiṁ ma-
4. -nyase subhūte api nu tathāgatasyaivaṁ bhavati na mayā dharmo deśita iti · yaḥ subhūte evaṁ vadet tathāgatena dharmo deśita iti · abhyācakṣīta māṁ sa subhūte asatād u-
5. -dgṛhītena · tat kasya hetor dharmadeśanā dharmadeśaneti subhūte nāsti sa kaścid dharmo yo dharmadeśanā nāmopalabhyate · āhāsti bhagavan kecit satvā bhaviṣyanty anāgate 'dhvani ya imā-
6. -n evaṁrūpān dharmān (bhāṣyamā)ṇāṁ cchrutvābhiśraddadhāsyanti · bhagavān āha · na te subhūte satvā nāsatvās tat kasya hetoḥ sarvasatvā iti subhūte asatvās te tathāgatena bhāṣitās teno-

Folio 10a (G 1388; Chak 188.30–189.21; Du 164.9–165.12; MM 41.9–42.7; Cz 54.1–55.8; Par 191.7–192.3; Tib 255.3.3–4.3)

1. -cyante sarvasatvā iti · tat kiṁ manyase subhūte api tv asti sa kaścid dharmo yas tathāgatenānuttarā samyaksaṁbodhir abhisaṁbuddhaḥ āha · nāsti sa bhagavan kaścid dharmo yas tathāgate-
2. -nānuttarā samyaksaṁbodhir abhisaṁbuddhaḥ bhagavān āha · evam etat subhūte evam etat aṇur api tatra dharmo na saṁvidyate nopalabhyate tenocyate 'nuttarā samyaksaṁbodhir iti · a-
3. -pi tu khalu punaḥ subhūte samaḥ sa dharmo na tatra kiṁcid viṣamas tenocyate 'nuttarā samyaksaṁbodhir iti · nirjīvatvena niḥsatvatvena niṣpudgalatvena samā sānuttarā samyaksaṁbo-
4. -dhiḥ sarvaiḥ kuśalair dharmair abhisaṁbudhyate · kuśalā dharmāḥ kuśalā dharmā iti subhūte adharmāś caiva te tathāgatena bhāṣitās tenocyante kuśalā dharmā iti · yaś ca kha-

5. -lu punaḥ subhūte yāvantas trisāhasramahāsāhasre lokadhātau sumeravaḥ parvatarājās tāvato rāśīn saptānāṁ ratnānām abhisaṁhṛtya dānaṁ dadyād yaś cetaḥ prajñāpāramitā-

6. -yā antaśaś catuṣpadikām api gāthām udgṛhya parebhyo deśayed asya subhūte puṇyaskandhasyāsau pūrvakaḥ puṇyaskandhaḥ śatatamīm api (ka)lān nopaiti · yāvad upani-

Folio 10b (G 1389; Chak 189.21-190.11; Du 165.12-166.14; MM 42.7-43.7; Cz 55.8-56.20; Par 192.3-192.21; Tib 255.4.3-5.4)

1. -śām api na kṣamate · tat kiṁ manyase subhūte api nu tathāgatasyaivaṁ bhavati · mayā satvā mocitā iti · na khalu punaḥ subhūte-r-evaṁ draṣṭavyaṁ · tat kasya hetoḥ na sa kaścit sa-

2. -tvo yas tathāgatena mocitaḥ yadi punaḥ subhūte kaścit satvo 'bhaviṣyad yas tathāgatena mocitaḥ sa eva tasyātmagrāho 'bhaviṣyat satvagrāho jīvagrāhaḥ pudgalagrāhaḥ

3. ātmagrāha iti subhūte agrāha eṣa tathāgatena bhāṣitaḥ sa ca bālapṛthagjanair udgṛhītaḥ bālapṛthagjanā iti subhūte ajanā ete tathāgatena

4. bhāṣitās tenocyaṁte bālapṛthagjanā iti · tat kiṁ manyase subhūte lakṣaṇasaṁpadā tathāgato draṣṭavyaḥ āhaivam etad bhagaval lakṣaṇasaṁpadā tathāgato draṣṭavyaḥ

5. bhagavān āha · sacet punaḥ subhūte lakṣaṇasaṁpadā tathāgato dra[ṣṭa]vyo 'bhaviṣyad rājāpi cakravartī tathāgato 'bhaviṣyat āha · yathāhaṁ bhagavato bhāṣitasyārtham ājā-

6. -nāmi · na lakṣaṇasaṁpadā tathāgato draṣṭavyaḥ)) atha khalu bhagavāṁs tasyāṁ velāyām imā gāthā abhāṣataḥ)) ye māṁ rūpeṇa adrākṣur ye māṁ ghoṣeṇa anvayuḥ mithyā-

Folio 11a (G 1390; Chak 190.12-191.4; Du 166.14-168.3; MM 43.7-44.6; Cz 56.20-59.1; Par 192.21-193.13; Tib 255.5.4-256.1.4)

1. -prahāṇaprasṛtā na māṁ drakṣyanti te janāḥ draṣṭavyo dharmato buddho dharmakāyas tathāgataḥ dharmatā cāpy avijñeyā na sā śakyaṁ vijānituṁ)) tat kiṁ manyase subhūte lakṣaṇasaṁpadā tathā-

2. -gatenānuttarā samyaksaṁbodhir abhisaṁbuddhāḥ na khalu punaḥ subhūte evaṁ draṣṭavyaṃ na subhūte lakṣaṇasaṁpadā tathāgatenānuttarā samyaksaṁbodhir abhisaṁbuddhā · yat khalu pu-
3. -naḥ subhūte syād evaṁ bodhisatvayānasaṁprasthitaiḥ kasyacid dharmasya vināśaḥ prajñapta ucchedo vā na khalu punaḥ subhūte evaṁ draṣṭavyaṁ · na bodhisatvayānasaṁprasthitaiḥ ka-
4. -syacid dharmasya vināśaḥ prajñapto nocchedaḥ yaś ca khalu punaḥ subhūte kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā gaṁgānadībālukopamāl lokadhātūn saptaratnapratipūrṇān kṛtvā (tathā-)
5. -gatebhyo 'rhadbhyaḥ samyaksaṁbuddhebhyo dānaṁ dadyād yaś ca bodhisatvo nirātmakeṣu dharmeṣu kṣāntiṁ pratilabheta · ayam eva tato bahutaraṁ puṇyaṁ prasaveta · na khalu punaḥ subhūte bo[dhi]-
6. -satvena puṇyaskandhaḥ parigrahītavyaḥ āha · puṇyaskandho bhagavan parigrahītavyaḥ bhagavān āha · parigrahītavyaḥ subhūte nodgrahītavyaḥ tenocyate pa(r)igra[hītavyaḥ]

Folio 11b (G 1391; Chak 191.5-26; Du 168.3-169.4; MM 44.7-45.4; Cz 54.1-60.7; Par 193.13-194.5; Tib 256.1.4-2.4)

1. api tu khalu punaḥ subhūte yaḥ kaścid evaṁ vadet tathāgato gacchati vāgacchati vā · tiṣṭhati vā niṣīdati vā śayyāṁ vā kalpayati · na me sa bhāṣitasyārtham ājānāti · tat ka(sya) [hetoḥ]
2. tathāgata iti subhūte na kutaścid āgato na kvacid gataḥ tenocyate tathāgato 'rhan samyaksaṁbuddha iti · yaś ca khalu punaḥ subhūte kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā yāvantas trisāhasra[mahā-]
3. -sāhasre lokadhātau pṛthivīrajāṁsi tāvato lokadhātūn maṣiṁ kuryāt tadyathāpi nāma paramāṇusaṁcayas tat kiṁ manyase subhūte bahu sa paramāṇusaṁcayo bhavet āhai-
4. -vam etad bhagavan bahu sa paramāṇusaṁcayo bhavet tat kasya hetoḥ saced bhagavan saṁcayo 'bhaviṣyan na bhagavān avakṣyat paramāṇusaṁcaya iti · tat kasya hetoḥ yo 'sau paramā-
5. -ṇusaṁcayo bhāṣitaḥ asaṁcayaḥ sa bhagavatā bhāṣitas tenocyate paramāṇusaṁcaya iti · yac ca tathāgato bhāṣati tṛsāhasramahāsāhasro lokadhātur iti · adhātuḥ sa tathā-

6. -gatena bhāṣitas tenocyate trisāhasramahāsāhasro lokadhātur iti · tat kasya hetoḥ saced bhagavan dhātur abhaviṣyat sa eva bhagavan piṇḍagrāho 'bhaviṣyad yaś caiva tathāgatena pi-

Folio 12a (G 1392; Chak 191.27-192.15; Du 169.4-170.7; MM 45.4-46.2; Cz 60.7-61.12; Par 194.5-194.22; Tib 256.2.4-3.4)

1. -ṇḍagrāho bhāṣitaḥ agrāhaḥ sa tathāgatena bhāṣitas tenocyate piṇḍagrāha iti · bhagavān āha · piṇḍagrāhaś caivāvyavahāro 'nabhilāpyaḥ subhūte sa dharmaḥ sa bālapṛ-
2. -thagjanair udgṛhītaḥ tat kasya hetoḥ yaḥ kaścit subhūte evaṁ vaded ātmadṛṣṭis tathāgatena bhāṣitā satvadṛṣṭir jīvadṛṣṭiḥ pudgaladṛṣṭiḥ api nu subhūte sa samyag vadan vadet
3. āha · no bhagavaṁs tat kasya hetoḥ yā sā bhagavann ātmadṛṣṭis tathāgatena bhāṣitā adṛṣṭiḥ sā tathāgatena bhāṣitā tenocyate ātmadṛṣṭir iti · bhagavān āha ·
4. evaṁ subhūte bodhisatvayānasaṁprasthitena sarvadharmā jñātavyā adhimoktavyās tathā cādhimoktavyā yathā na dharmasaṁjñāpi pratyupatiṣṭhet tat kasya hetoḥ dharmasaṁjñā
5. dharmasaṁjñeti subhūte asaṁjñaiṣā tathāgatena bhāṣitā tenocyate dharmasaṁjñeti · yaś ca khalu punaḥ subhūte bodhisatvo mahāsatvaḥ aprameyāsaṁkhyeyāl lokadhātūn saptaratnapa-
6. -ripūrṇān kṛtvā dānan dadyād yaś ca kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā itaḥ prajñāpāramitāyā antaśaś catuṣpadikām api gāthām udgṛhya dhārayed deśayet paryavāpnuyād a-

Folio 12b (G 1393; Chak 192.16-25; Du 170.7-15; MM 46.2-11; Cz 61.12-62.8; Par 194.22-195.7; Tib 256.3.4-3.8)

1. -yam eva tato bahutaraṁ puṇyaṁ prasavetāprameyam asaṁkhyeyaṁ · kathaṁ ca saṁprakāśayet yathā na prakāśayet tenocyate saṁprakāśaye iti ·)) tārakā timiraṁ dīpo mā-
2. -yāvaśyāya budbudaḥ supinaṁ vidyud abhraṁ ca evaṁ draṣṭavya saṁskṛtaṃ ·)) idam avocad bhagavān āttamanā sthavira subhūtis te ca bhikṣubhikṣuṇyupāsakopāsikāḥ sadevamānuṣāsu-
3. -ragandharvaś ca loko bhagavato bhāṣitam abhyanandan)) ·)) vajracchedikā prajñāpāramitā samāptāḥ)) ·))

TEXTUAL NOTES

Folio 5a

1. **yā(vat) subhūt(e)** MM, Cz, Tib *tat kiṁ manyase subhūte yāvat*, but Cz's notation for G and Par is wrong; they both have *yāvat subhūte*, and both omit *tat kiṁ manyase.* **kaccit** Chak w. *kaścit*, which is cited by Cz. **vahu** Chak, Du w. *bahu.* **āha** Cz *subhūtir āha*, but with no indication that G and Par omit *subhūtir.* **bahu bhagavan tat pṛthivīrajaḥ** Cz's notation for Par is wrong here; although it has more than G it too omits *bahu sugata.* **arajas tathāgatena** Du w. *arajas tat tathāgatena*, probably under the influence of MM and Par. **bhāṣitas** Du w. *bhāṣitam*; cf. Chak n. 1 on page 182.
2. **adhātuḥ** Chak w. *adhātuṁ*; because of his insertion of material from MM, Du's sandhi does not correspond to that found in the MS. **bhāṣitas** Du w. *bhāṣitaḥ.* **dvātṛṁśatā** Du w. *dvātriṁśan*; Cz cites G w. as *dvātriṁśatā.*
3. **āha** Cz *subhūtir āha*, but with no indication that both G and Par omit *subhūtir.* **no** Cz *no hīdaṁ*, and while he indicates that Par has *no iti* instead, he does not indicate that G both omits *hīdaṁ* and has nothing corresponding to Par's *iti.* **bhagavaṁs** Du w. *bhagavan*; after *bhagavan* Cz has *na dvātriṁśanmahāpuruṣa-lakṣaṇais tathāgato 'rhan saṁyaksambuddho draṣṭavyaḥ*, which he indicates is missing in G and Tib; he fails to note that it is also missing from Par. **heto tāni tāni** Chak w. *hetor yāni tāni*; Du w. *hetoḥ / yāni [hi] tāni*; although the first *tāni* is slightly blurred, it is clearly not possible to read *-r yāni.* Cz has *hetoḥ yāni hi tāni bhagavan*; he indicates only that G omits *hi*, but in fact both *hi* and *bhagavan* are omitted by both G and Par as well as Tib. **bhāṣitāny alakṣaṇāni** Du w. *bhāṣitāni alakṣaṇāni.* **tenocyante** Chak, Du w. *-ocyate.* **mahāpuruṣalakṣaṇāniti** Chak w. *-lakṣa-ṇānītī*; Du w. *-lakṣaṇāni iti.*

4. **gaṁgānadībālukopamān** Chak, Du w. *gaṅgānadīvālukopamān.* **parityajed** Chak w. *parityajyed;* Du w. *parityajet.* **catuṣpadikām** Chak, Du w. *catuṣpādikām;* cf. Par. **deśayed** Du has *deśayet* because he inserts after it a piece of text from MM and is therefore "required" to alter the sandhi found in the MS. This kind of thing is very frequent in Du and will not normally be noted hereafter. MM and Cz add *samprakāśayed* after *deśayed* and, while Cz indicates that this is missing from G, he does not indicate that it was probably also missing from Par; cf. Par n. 4 on page 183.

5. **asaṁkhyeyaṃ** Chak, Du w. *-am.* **āyuṣmāṁ** Du w. *-an.* **subhūtir** Du w. *-iḥ.* **dharmapravegenāsrūṇi** Chak w. *-pravegenāśruni;* Du w. *-pravegeṇāśrūni.* Both here and in the following *'srūṇi* the dental *s* is quite clear. Cz has *-vegena-* without noting G's *pra-*. **prāmuṁcat** Du w. *prāmuñcat.* **'srūṇi** Chak w. *'śruṇi;* Du w. *'śrūni.* **prāmṛjya** Du w. *pramṛjya,* but cf. his n. 4 on page 152.

6. **bhagavaṁ** Du w. *bhagavan.*

7. **samanvāgatā** after *samanvāgatā* MM, Cz have *bodhisattvā;* Cz indicates this is missing in Par and G, but not that it is also missing in Tib which has *sems can de dag ni.* **bhāṣyamāṇe** after *bhāṣyamāṇe* MM, Cz have *śrutvā;* Cz indicates it is missing in Par and G, but it is also missing in Tib. **saivāx–ṁ(j)–x–ā xsmāt** Chak *saivābhūtasaṁjñā tasmāt,* but this is clearly too much for the space in the MS; Du has *saivā[bhūta]saṁjñā tasmāt,* the reading of MM. Although mostly obliterated, it is virtually certain from the MS that there were only three akṣaras in the space, and enough remains to indicate that the first two were probably *saṁjñā;* the third akṣara would then have been *ta-*. Par has *saivāsaṁjñā tasmā* and Tib *de nyid 'du shes ma mchis pa . . . de bas na.* Read: *saivāsaṁjñā tasmāt.*

Folio 5b

1. **(bh)ūxxx(bh)ūtasaṁjñeti** since MM and Par have *bhūtasaṁjñā bhūtasaṁjñeti* (so MM; Par *-saṁjñā iti*), and since this would fit the gap perfectly, it is safe to assume that G too read *bhūtasaṁjñā bhūtasaṁjñeti,* which is also the reading of Tib. **āścaryaṁ** note that Cz rejects *āścaryaṁ,* the reading of G, MM and Tib, and prefers *duṣkaraṁ,* the reading of Par and Ku. **bhāṣyamāṇam** Chak

w. *bhaṣyamāṇam*. **avakalpayāmy** Du w. *-kalpayāmi*. **adhimucya** Du w. *adhimucye*; the reading of G could be the result of the loss or accidental omission of the vowel sign. **satvā** in both MM and Cz the following passage occurs after *satvā*: *bhaviṣyanty anāgate 'dhvani paścime kāle paścime samaye paścimāyāṁ pañcaśatyāṁ saddharmavipralope vartamāne ya*. Cz indicates that all of this is missing in G, but he does not indicate that Par too omits the greater part of it. Par probably had only *paścimāyāṁ pañcaśatyāṁ* and no more. Tib too, though fuller than Par, omitted *anāgate 'dhvani* and *saddharmavipralope vartamāne*, but Cz does not indicate this either. **imaṁ** Cz has *bhagavan* after *imaṁ* and he does not indicate that it is omitted by G, Par and Tib.

2. **paramāścaryasamanvāgatā** Du adopts the reading of MM and Cz: *paramāścaryeṇa samanvāgatā*, though he cites the actual MS reading in his n. 2. Cz indicates that G reads *paramāścaryasamanvāgatā*, but he does not indicate that Par has the same reading. **api tu khalu punar** Chak w. *api khalu*; Cz, following Chak, indicates that *tu* and *khalu* are missing in G; this, however, is not the case. Note that what I have read as *tu* in G could also be read as *tṛ*. **pravartsyate** Du w. *pravartiṣyate*. **na satvasaṁjñā na jīvasaṁjñā** Du w. *na jīvasaṁjñā na sattvasaṁjñā*; that is to say, Du has here inadvertently inverted the order. **pudgalasaṁjñā** after *pudgalasaṁjñā* Cz has *pravartiṣyate na-api teṣāṁ kācit saṁjña* (read *-ā*) *na-a-saṁjñā pravartate. tat kasya hetoḥ. yā sa bhagavann ātmasaṁjña* (read *-ā*) *saiva-a-saṁjñā yā sattva-saṁjñā jīvasaṁjñā pudgala-saṁjñā saiva-a-saṁjñā*. Cz's notation here is very confused and incomplete. First, he indicates that *na-api teṣāṁ kācit saṁjñā na-a-saṁjñā pravartate* is not found in Par, but he does not indicate that it is also missing in G and Tib. Secondly—and here probably the result of a printing error—since there is a marker at the end of the passage, but no marker at the beginning to indicate where the omission begins, it is not clear that G omits all the rest of this passage as well. **sarvasaṁjñā(pagatā)** in Chak this is printed by mistake as *sarvasaṁjñā pagatā*.

3. **bhagavān āha** where G has only *bhagavān āha*, Cz has *evam ukte bhagavān āyuṣmantam subhūtim etad avocat* (= Par, MM, Tib); this is not noted in Cz. **ya** Du w. *yatra*. **saṁtrasiṣyanti** Chak w. *saṁtrāsiṣyanti*; Du w. *santrasiṣyanti*. **sa(ṁ)trā(sam)** Chak w. *saṁtrasam*; Du w. *santrāsam*.

4. **paramapāramiteyaṁ** in Chak this is printed by mistake as *paramapā ramiteyaṁ*; Du w. *paramapāramitā iyaṁ*. **yāṁ ca** after *yāṁ ca* Cz adds *subhūte* without a note; but *subhūte* is not found in G, Par or Tib. Moreover, just before *yaṁ ca* Du adds without brackets *yadutāpāramitā*, which he appears to have taken from MM. **aparimāṇā** after *aparimāṇā* Du adds without brackets or a note *api*; this does not occur in the MS or in Tib (Par is fragmentary). **buddhā** Chak w. *buddha*.

5. **-ramapāramiteti** Du w. *-pāramitā iti*. **ya** Chak, Du w. *yā*. **kalirājāṅgapratyaṁgamāṁsāny** Chak w. *-pratyaṇga-*; Du w. *kalirājo 'ṅgapratyaṅgamāṁsani*. MM and Cz both read *kaliṅga*(-); cf. the former's n. 2 on page 31 and the latter's n. 5 on page 41.

6. **tasmin** Chak misprinted as *ta-asmin*. **jīvasaṁjñā** the akṣara I have transliterated *jī* may in fact have a superscribed *r*. **'bhaviṣyad** Du w. *abhaviṣyat*. **atīte 'dhvani** Chak w. printed *atītedhvani*; Du w. *atīte adhvani*. **paṁca** Du w. *pañca*.

7. **yo 'haṁ** Du w. *yadāhaṁ* with the following note "MS. *yemāṁ.*" The *yo*, however, is very clear and beyond any doubt. What Du takes as *māṁ* I read with reservations *haṁ*; these two akṣaras can look very much alike. **kṣāntivādī** Chak w. *-vādi*. **abhūvaṁs** Du w. *abhūvaṁ*. **nātmasaṁjñābhūn** Du w. *nātmasaṁjñā abhūt*; Cz *na-ātmasaṁjñā babhūva* with no note citing G. **varjayitvā** Cz *vivarjayitvā* with no note citing G.

Folio 7a

1. **mamāṁsena** Chak, Du w. *samāṁśena*; MM and Cz also read *samāṁśena* and Cz adds a note (pages 116–17) in which he seems to want to account for the fact that the reading *samāṁśena*, which he thinks is correct, does not correspond to the reading of Tib. Tib has *nga'i byang chub phrag pa la thogs par 'gyur ro* and this, of course, corresponds exactly with the actual reading of G. Both Chak and Du must have been influenced by MM. Although the initial *ma-* is, in the MS, slightly smudged at the bottom, the dental *s*—which cannot be confused with the palatal *ś* in this script—is absolutely certain and there is virtually no possible doubt that G reads *mamāṁsena*. Tib then, unlike Cz, MM, Chak and Du, clearly reflects the "true" reading, and the recognition of this reading renders the remarks of Cz (page 116) superfluous. Note too that

Cz's text has between *-rimāṇena* and *sarve* the phrase *puṇyaskandhena samanvāgatā bhaviṣyanti* which is not found in G, although Cz does not indicate this. The same applies to the *subhūte* between *te* and *sattvāḥ* in Cz.

2. **sthānaṁ** Chak w. *sthānānī,* which Cz cites in his note. **pṛthivīpradeśe** Du w. *-pradeśa.* **prakāśayiṣyati** Chak w. *-iṣyate.*
3. **caityabhūta** Du w. *-bhūtaḥ.*
4. **satvānāṁ** Chak omits *satvānāṁ* although it is in the MS. The *subhūte* preceding *satvānāṁ* in Cz is not found in G. **–janmikāny** Du w. *-janmikāni.*
5. **apāyasaṁvartanīyāni** in Chak this is misprinted as *apāya saṁvartanīyāni.* **tāni** Chak omits *tāni* although it is in the MS; it is, however, not found in MM and Cz. **'dhvany** Du w. *'dhvani.*
6. **ddīpaṁkarasya** Chak w. *ddipaṁkarasya*; Du w. *dīpaṅkarasya.* **caturaśītir buddhakoṭīniyutaśatasahasrāṇy** Chak w. *caturaśītibuddhakoṭi–*; Du w. *caturaśītibuddhakoṭīniyutaśatasahasrāṇi.* **ārāgya** Chak w. *ārāgyā,* which is cited in Cz's notes.

Folio 7b

1. **bhagavanta** Du w. *bhagavantaḥ.* **carime** Du reads *carime*; Chak *varime.* I am not certain; *va–* and *ca–* can be virtually indistinguishable. **paṁcāśatyāṁ** Du w. *pañcaśatyāṁ.* **varttamānāyām** Du emends to *vartamāna* and in his n. 2 w. cites the MS as *vartamānāyām.* **imāṁ** Du w. *imān.*
2. **pūrvakaḥ** Cz reads *paurvakaḥ* and, although he notes the reading of Par, he does not cite G. **śatatamīm** Chak w. *śatamīm.* **kalān** Du w. *kalāṁ.* **apy** Du w. *api.*
3. **kulaputrāṇāṁ** Chak w. *-pūtranām.* **kuladuhitrīṇāṁ** Du w. *-duhitṝṇāṁ.* **ca** Chak omits *ca* although it is found in the MS; its presence in G is not noted in Cz. **bhāṣeyaṁ** Du w. *bhāṣeya.* **yāvantas te satvā** Du emends to *yāvat te* and cites the MS in his n. 7 where he w. gives *sattvāḥ.*
4. **parigrahīṣyanti** Chak, Du w. *prati–* which is also the reading of MM and Cz. **asyācintya** Du w. *asya acintya.*

5. **āha** where G has only *āha* Cz has *atha khalv āyuṣmān subhūtir bhagavantam etad avocat* (MM and Tib also have this reading), but Cz has not noted G. **pragṛhītavyaṁ** Chak w. *pragrahītavyaṁ*; Du w. [*pra*]*grahītavyam*; Du's brackets are here more than usually mysterious since *pra-* is quite clearly in the MS. **bodhisatvayāna-saṁprasthitenaivaṁ** Chak w. -(aivam); Du w. -*tena evaṁ*.

6. **–dayitavyaṁ** Chak is misprinted as -*dayita vyaṁ*.

Folio 8a

1. **pravartteta** Chak, Du w. *pravarteta.*

2. **dīpaṁkarasya** Du w. *dīpaṅkarasya.* **tathāgatasyāntikād** Chak w. *tathāgatasya antikād.* **samyaksaṁbodhim** Chak w. -*sambodhim.* **abhisaṁbuddhaḥ** Chak w. -*sambuddhaḥ.* **āha** Cz has *evam ukta āyuṣmān subhūtir bhagavantam etad avocat* instead of G's *āha*, but the reading of G is not noted.

3. **tathāgatasyāntikād** Du w. -*āntikāt.* **anuttarā** Chak, Du w. *anuttarāṁ.* **samyaksaṁbodhim** Chak w. -*sambodhim.* **abhisaṁbuddhaḥ** Chak w. -*sambuddhaḥ.* **āha** Cz has *evam ukte bhagavān āyuṣmantam subhūtim etad avocat* instead of G's *āha*, but the reading of G is not noted. **vyākṛto** Du w. *vyākṛtaḥ.* **bhaviṣyasi** Du reads *bhaviṣyasi* but cites the MS w. in a note as *bhaviṣyāmi.* **māṇavānāgate** Chak w. *mānavānāgate*; Du w. *māṇava anāgate.*

4. **samyaksaṁbuddhas** Chak w. -*sambuddhas*; Du w. -*buddhaḥ.* **tathāgata** Chak is misprinted as *tathā gata.* **adhivacanaṁ** Du w. -*vacanam.* Cz notes that a passage is added in MM after -*vacanaṃ* which is not found in Ku, Par and Tib; it is also not found in G although Cz does not note this. **tathāgatenānuttarā** Du w. *tathāgatena anuttarā*; he also w. cites the MS reading in n. 2 as *anuttarāṁ.* **samyaksaṁbodhir** Chak w. -*sambodhir*; Du in his n. 2 w. cites the MS as -*saṁbodhim.* **abhisaṁbuddheti** Chak w. -*sambuddheti*; Du in his n. 2 w. cites the MS as -*saṁbuddhaḥ.*

5. **tathāgatenānuttarā** Du w. *tathāgatena anuttarāṁ.* **samyak-saṁbodhir** Du w. -*bodhim.* **abhisaṁbuddhaḥ** Chak w. -*sambuddhaḥ.* **mṛṣāḥ** Chak reads w. *mṛsaḥ* and then adds a note saying "Rd. *mṛṣā–*," but the MS does read *mṛṣāḥ*! Du w. *mṛṣā.* It is pos-

sible, of course, that what I have transliterated here as *-ḥ* was intended only as a mark of punctuation.

6. **–sarvadharmā iti** Chak has w. omitted *sarvadharmā iti* and Cz, as a consequence, w. indicates that it is missing in G. **tenocyante** Chak w. *tenocyate,* which Cz cites; Du w. *tena ucyante.* **bhaved** Du w. *bhavet.*

Folio 8b

1. **bhāṣita** Du w. *bhāṣitaḥ.* **bhāṣitas** Du w. *bhāṣitaḥ.* **tenocyate** Du w. *tena ucyate.* **etat** Du w. *etate.*
2. **vaded** Chak, Du w. *vadet.* **parinirvāpayiṣyāmīti** Du w. *-nirvāpayiṣyāmi iti.* **āha** Cz has *subhūtir āha,* without noting that G omits *subhūtir.*
3. **niḥsatvāḥ** Cz's notation here is potentially misleading since it seems to suggest that G reads *sarvadharmā niḥsattvāḥ,* which is not the case. **sarvadharmāḥ** Du w. *-dharmā.* **vaded** Du w. *vadet.* **niṣpādayiṣyāmīti** Chak w. *niṣpadayiṣyamīti;* Du w. *niṣpāda-yiṣyāmi iti.*
4. **kṣetravyūhāḥ kṣetravyūhā iti** Chak w. *kṣetravyūhā iti,* omitting one of the two *kṣetravyūhās* found in the MS; Cz w. follows Chak. **bhāṣitās** Chak w. *bhāṣitas.* **tenocyante** Chak w. *tenocyate,* which Cz cites; Du w. *tena ucyante.* **bodhisatvo** Chak is misprinted as *boodhisatvo.* **nirātmāno** Chak w. *nirātmano.*
5. **–tmāno** Chak w. *nirātmano.* **bodhisatva** Cz reads *bodhisattvo mahāsattva* and, although he notes that G has a second *bodhisatva* in place of *mahāsattva,* he does not note that Par agrees with G. **ā(khyāta)s** Du w. *ākhyātaḥ.* After *ākhyātas* Cz has *bhagavān āha,* but he does not note that this is missing in G, Par and Tib. **āha** Cz has *subhūtir āha* without noting that it is missing in G and Par.
6. **cakṣuḥ** Du w. *divyacakṣuḥ.* **prajñā(ca)kṣur** Du w. *-cakṣuḥ.* **dharmacakṣur** Du w. *-cakṣuḥ.* **āhaivam** Du w. *āha evam.*

Folio 9a

1. **divyaṁ cakṣuḥ** Du w. *divyacakṣuḥ.* **pra(jñāca)kṣur** Du w. *-cakṣuḥ.* **dharmacakṣur** Du w. *-cakṣuḥ.* **bhagavān āha** Du w. omits *bhagavān āha.* **yāvantyo** Chak w. *yavantyo.* **gaṁgā-nadyāṁ** Du w. *gaṅgā-*; Cz has *gaṅgāyāṁ mahānadyāṁ* without noting G. **bālukās** Chak, Du w. *vālukās.* **tāvantya** Du reads *tāvatyo* with a note w. citing the MS as *yāvantyo.* **gaṁgānadyo** Du w. *gaṅgā-.* **bhaveyus** Du w. *bhaveyuḥ.* **bālukās** Chak, Du w. *vālukās.*

2. **kaccid** Chak w. *kaścid,* which is cited by Cz; Du reads *kaccid* but then w. cites the MS as *kaścit.* **bhaveyuḥ** Chak w. *bhaveyūḥ*; Du adds after *bhaveyuḥ* a sentence not found in the MS: *subhūtir āha / evam etat bhagavann evam etat sugata bahavas te lokadhātavaḥ*; this Du presumably took from MM, which has virtually the same reading, although it adds *bhaveyuḥ* after *lokadhātavaḥ*; Cz has the same reading as MM without noting the omission in G. **jānīyās** Chak has been misprinted as *jā nīyās*; Du reads *prajānāmi* and w. cites the MS as *jānīyaḥ.*

3. **–ś** Du w. *hetoḥ.* **cittadhārā** Du w. *-dhārāś.* **bhāṣitās** Chak w. *bhāsitās.* **tenocyante** Chak w. *tenocyate.* **hetor** Chak, Du w. *hetoḥ.* **nopalabhyate** Chak w. *nopalabyate.* **anāgataṁ cittaṁ** Du w. *anāgatacittaṁ.*

4. **pratyutpannaṁ** Chak misprinted as *pratyuypannaṁ.* **ya** Du w. *yaḥ.* **dānan** Du w. *dānaṁ.* **dadyād** Du w. *dadyāt.*

5. **puṇyaṁ** Cz has *puṇyaskandhaṁ* without noting that G omits *-skandhaṁ.* **prasaveta** both Chak and Du also read *prasaveta,* but the final akṣara could also be read *-tā.* **āha** Cz has *subhūtir āha* without noting that G omits *subhūtir*; Du w. omits everything from the first *āha* in line 5 down to *prasaveta* in line 6. Chak w. *aha.* **vahu** Chak w. *bahu.*

6. **puṇyaṁ** Chak w. *puṇyam,* which Cz cites (this citation could be misleading since Cz gives only *puṇyam* as the equivalent in G for his *puṇyaskandhaṁ,* when in fact the equivalent in G is *bahu puṇyaṁ*). **sacet** Du w. *sa cat.*

Folio 9b

1. **āha** Cz has *subhūtir āha* without noting that both G and Par omit *subhūtir*. **rūpakāyapariniṣpattī** Du w. *-pariniṣpattiḥ*. **ity apariniṣpattir eṣā** Du has *iti apariniṣpattir iti [bhagavan] apariniṣpattir eṣā*, etc., but his first *apariniṣpattir*, as well as the following *iti*, not only do not occur in the MS, but are not found in MM, Cz, Par or Tib. Cz does have the *bhagavan* but does not indicate that it is not found in G.

2. **tenocyate** Du reads *anena ucyate*, but cites the MS as reading *tena*. **āha** Cz has *subhūtir āha* without noting that *subhūtir* is not found in G. **bhagavan** Chak is misprinted as *bhavan*.

3. **tenocyate** Du w. *tena ucyate*.

4. **tathāgatasyaivaṁ** Chak w. *-aivam*. **na** Du w. omits *na*. **asatād** Cz has *'satodgṛhītena*, and both Chak and Du, though they cite the MS correctly, would emend to this. Cz does not note the reading of G.

5. **–dgṛhītena** Chak w. *udgṛhitena*. **hetor** Du w. *hetoḥ*. **dharmadeśaneti** Du w. *-deśanā iti*. **āhāsti** Du w. *āha asti*; Cz has *āha* instead of *evam ukta āyuṣmān subhūtir bhagavantam etad avocat*, without indicating the reading of G. **bhaviṣyanty** Du w. *bhaviṣyanti*. **anāgate 'dhvani** Chak is misprinted as *anāgatedhvani*; after *'dhvani* Cz has *paścime kāle paścime samaye paścimāyāṁ pañcaśatyāṁ saddharmavipralope vartamāṇe* and, while he notes that none of this occurs in G, he does not indicate that neither could it have occurred in Par nor is it found in Tib.

6. **(bhāṣyamā)ṇāṁ** Chak w. *bhāṣamānāṁ*; Du w. *bhāṣyamaṇān*; Cz omits *bhāṣyamāṇāṁ* and, while he notes that G has it (he cites the incorrect reading of Chak), he does not note that Par probably had something like it, and that Tib also has it. **cchrutvābhiśraddadhāsyanti** Du w. *śrutvābhiśraddhāsyanti*. **nāsatvās** Chak w. *nāsatvā*; Du w. *na asattvāḥ*. **bhāṣitās** Du w. *bhāṣitāḥ*.

Folio 10a

1. **–cyante** Chak w. *-cyate*. **tv** Chak w. *nv*; Du w. *nu*. **tathāgatenānuttarā** Chak w. *-anuttara*; Du w. *tathāgatena anuttarāṁ*. **samyaksaṁbodhir** Chak w. *samyaksambodhir*; Du w. *samyaksaṁ-*

bodhim. **abhisaṁbuddhaḥ** Chak w. *-sambuddhaḥ.* **āha** Cz has *āyuṣmān subhūtir āha,* without noting that G does not have the first two words.

2. **–nānuttarā** Chak is misprinted as *-anuttarāsamyak-,* etc.; Du w. *tathāgatena anuttarāṁ.* **samyaksaṁbodhir** Chak w. *-sambodhir;* Du w. *-saṁbodhim.* **abhisaṁbuddhaḥ** Chak w. *-sambuddhaḥ.* **tenocyate** Du w. *tena ucyate.* **'nuttarā** Du w. *anuttarā.* **samyaksaṁbodhir** Chak w. *-sambodhir.* **iti** Chak w. *ity.*
3. **tu** Du w. prints *tu* in brackets. **kiṁcid** Du w. [*kaścid*]; both the reading and the brackets are wrong. **viṣamas** Du w. *viṣamaḥ.* **tenocyate** Du w. *tena ucyate.* **'nuttarā** Du w. *anuttarā.* **samyaksaṁbodhir** Chak w. *-sambodhir.* **nirjīvatvena** Du w. *nirjīvitvena.* **sānuttarā** Chak w. *sānuttara.*
4. **–dhiḥ** Chak w. *-sambodhiḥ.* **sarvaiḥ** Du is misprinted as *sarveḥ.* **kuśalair** Chak, Du w. *kuśalaiḥ.* **bhāṣitās** Du w. *bhāṣitāḥ.* **tenocyante** Chak, Du w. *tenocyate.*
5. **subhūte** after *subhūte* Cz adds *strī vā puruso vā* and, although he notes that this is not found in G, he does not note that it also does not occur in Par and that Tib has for the beginning of this passage *rigs kyi bu 'am / rigs kyi bu mo gang la la zhig gis,* etc. **trisāhasramahāsāhasre** Chak w. *-mahāsahasre.* **abhisaṁhṛtya** Chak misprinted as *abhisaṁhaṛtya.* **dadyād** Du w. *dadyāt.* **yaś cetaḥ** Chak w. *yaś caiva,* which is cited by Cz.
6. **catuṣpadikām** Chak, Du *catuṣpādikām.* **deśayed** Du w. *deśayet.* **asya** Du w. *etasya.* **(ka)lān** Du w. *kalāṁ.* **yāvad** Chak w. *yavad.*

Folio 10b

1. **tathāgatasyaivaṁ** Chak w. *-aivam.* **subhūte–r–evaṁ** Chak has *subhūte cevaṁ* (Cz cites G as *caivaṁ,* but *caivaṁ* is only an emendation suggested by Chak in a note and not the reading found in the MS); Du has w. *subhūte evaṁ. ce* and *re* frequently can only be distinguished with difficulty—if at all—in the script. I have read *r* and, on the assumption that this is the correct reading, I would intrepret *r* here as an "inorganic" sandhi consonant or "hiatus-bridger." But the use of such "hiatus-bridgers," though common enough elsewhere, is certainly not characteristic of our MS. **draṣṭavyaṁ** Du w. *draṣṭavyam.*

2. **'bhaviṣyad** Du w. *'bhaviṣyat.* **pudgalagrāhaḥ** Du w. *pudgala-grā[ho 'bhaviṣyat]*.

3. **ātmagrāha** Chak is misprinted as *ātamgrāha.* **ete** Chak, Du w. *eva te.*

4. **bhāṣitās** Du w. *bhāṣitāḥ.* **tenocyaṁte** Chak, Du w. *tenocyante.* **lakṣaṇasaṁpadā** Chak w. *-sampadā.* **āhaivam etad** Chak w. *āhai vaṁ,* omitting *etad*; Du w. *āha / evam etad.* **bhagaval lakṣaṇasaṁpadā** Du w. *bhagavan lakṣaṇa-*; Cz cites G as *evaṁ bhagavann alakṣaṇasampadā,* which is not the reading of Chak, but an emendation suggested by Chak in a note. Moreover, Cz does not indicate the reading of Par, which is essentially the same as G: *āha · evam eva bhagavaṁ lakṣaṇasaṁpadāyās tathāgato draṣṭa-vyaḥ.* What is in Cz a negative statement is in both G and Par an affirmative statement.

5. **punaḥ** Chak w. omits *punaḥ* and Cz, following Chak, w. indicates that *punaḥ* is not found in G. **lakṣaṇasaṁpadā** Chak w. *-sampadā.* **dra[ṣṭa]vyo** neither Chak nor Du indicate that *-ṣṭa-* has been inadvertently omitted in the MS. **'bhaviṣyad** Du w. *'bhaviṣyat.* **'bhaviṣyat** Chak *bhaviṣyad.* **āha** for G's *āha* Cz has *āyuṣmān subhūtir bhagavantam etad avocat* but, without noting G or Par, the latter having only *āyuṣmāṁ subhūtir āha.* **yathāhaṁ** Chak w. *yathāham.*

6. **lakṣaṇasaṁpadā** Chak w. *-sampadā.* **bhagavāṁs** Chak w. *bhagavaṁs.* **imā gāthā** Du w. *ime gāthe.* **abhāṣataḥ**)) Chak and Du both have *abhāṣata* and it is very possible that the : of the :)) after *-ta* should simply be taken as part of the mark of punctuation, :)) being a variant form of ·)). **adrākṣur** Du w. *cādrākṣur*; Cz reads *ca-adrākṣur* and, though he notes that G does not have *ca,* he does not note that it is also missing from Par. **anvayuḥ** Cz has *ca-anvayuḥ* and w. indicates that G and Par also have the *ca,* though it occurs in neither.

Folio 11a

1. **dharmatā cāpy avijñeyā** Chak w. *dharmato cāsya vijñeyā,* which Cz cites; Du w. *dharmatā cāpy abhijñeyā.* **sā** Chak w. *sa,* which Cz cites. **vijānituṁ** Chak w. *vijānitum.* **lakṣaṇasaṁpadā** Chak w. *-sampadā.*

2. **samyaksaṁbodhir** Chak w. *-sambodhir.* **abhisaṁbuddhāḥ** Chak w. *abhisambuddhaḥ*; Du w. *abhisaṁbuddhā.* **lakṣaṇasaṁpadā** Chak w. *-sampadā.* **samyaksaṁbodhir** Chak w. *-sambodhir.* **abhisaṁbuddhā** Chak w. *abhisambuddhaḥ.*

3. **syād** Chak w. *syad,* which is cited by Cz. **evaṁ** Chak w. *evam.* **prajñapta** Du w. *prajñaptaḥ.* **vā** Du w. adds an *iti* after *vā*, which is not found in the MS (Du probably took it from MM or Cz). **draṣṭavyaṁ** Du w. *draṣṭavyam.*

4. **yaś ca** Du w. *yat.* **gaṁgānadībālukopamāl** Chak w. *gaṁgānadīvālukosamāh*; Du w. *gaṅgānadīvālukopamān.* **saptaratnapratipūrṇān** Chak w. *-pūrṇāṅ.*

5. **samyaksaṁbuddhebhyo** Chak misprinted as *-sambuddhebyo.* **dadyād** Du w. *dadyāt.* **bahutaraṁ** Chak w. *-taram.* **puṇyaṁ** Cz has *puṇyaskandhaṁ,* without noting the reading of G.

6. **āha** Cz has *āyuṣmān subhūtir āha* for the first *āha* in G, but does not note G's lack of the first two words. **pa(r)igra[hītavyaḥ]** the last few syllables of the line have been obliterated, but the reconstruction given here in brackets is fairly certain.

Folio 11b

1. **vāgacchati** Du w. *vā āgacchati.* **me** Cz inserts *subhūte* after *me* but does not note that it occurs in neither G nor Par. **[hetoḥ]** the final syllables of the line have been obliterated but the reconstruction given here in brackets is fairly certain.

2. **samyaksaṁbuddha** Chak w. *-sambuddhaḥ.* **subhūte** Chak is misprinted as *subhū te.* **yāvantas** Du reads *yāvanti* and cites the MS reading w. as *yāvanta.* **trisāhasra[mahā–]** the final syllables of this line have also been obliterated, but again the bracketed reconstruction is fairly certain.

3. **tāvato** Chak w. *tavato.* **lokadhātūn** Chak w. *lokadhātuṁ,* which is cited by Cz. **paramāṇusaṁcayas** Chak w. *paramānusaṁcayaḥ*; Du w. *-sañcayaḥ.* In what follows here the MS always has *saṁcaya,* but in every case but one Du w. prints *sañcaya*; this will not be noted hereafter. **bahu** Du w. *bahuḥ.* **paramāṇusaṁcayo** Chak w. *paramānusaṁśayo.*

4. **–vam** Du w. *āha / evaṁ*; Cz has *subhūtir āha: evam*, without noting G or Par, neither of which has the *subhūtir*. **bhagavan** Chak w. *bhagavān*. **bahu** Du w. *bahuḥ*. **paramāṇusaṁcayo** Chak w. *paramānu–*. **bhagavan** Chak w. *bhagavān*. **'bhaviṣyan** Du w. *'bhaviṣyat*. **paramāṇusaṁcaya** Chak w. *paramānu–*.

5. **–ṇusaṁcayo** Chak w. *'sauparamānu–*. **asaṁcayaḥ** Chak w. *asaṁcaya*. **bhāṣitas** Du w. *bhāṣitaḥ*. **paramāṇusaṁcaya** Chak w. *paramānu–*. **yac ca** Chak, Du w. *yaś ca*. **bhāṣati** Du w. *bhāṣate*. **tṛsāhasramahāsāhasro** Chak, Du w. *tri–*.

6. **bhāṣitas** Du w. *bhāṣitaḥ*. **bhagavan** Chak w. *bhagavān* for the first *bhagavan* in the line. **abhaviṣyat** Chak w. *abhavisyat*. **bhagavan** Cz omits the second *bhagavan* without noting that it is found in G. **'bhaviṣyad** Du w. *'bhaviṣyat*. **tathāgatena** in Cz *tathāgatena* follows rather than precedes *piṇḍagrāhas*, but its placement in G is not noted in Cz; Par has the same word order as G.

Folio 12a

1. **–ṇḍagrāho** Chak w. *-graho*. **bhāṣitas** Du w. *bhāṣitaḥ*. **caivāvyavahāro** Cz has *caiva subhūte 'vyavahāro*, but the *subhūte* Cz places after *caiva* G has after *'nabhilāpyaḥ* and Par after *caivāvyavahāro*. None of this is noted by Cz. **sa dharmaḥ** Cz has *na sa dharmo*, without noting that G omits the *na*.

2. **–thagjanair** Chak is misprinted as *bāla pṛthagjanair*. **vaded** Du w. *vadet*. **ātmadṛṣṭis** Chak w. *-dṛṣtis*. **sa** Du w. puts *sa* in brackets; in Cz the order of *subhūte* and *sa* is inverted without a note. **samyag** Du w. *samyak*.

3. **āha** Cz has *subhūtir āha* without noting G. **no** Cz w. indicates that *no* is omitted in G. **bhagavaṁs** Du w. *bhagavan*. **bhagavann** Du w. *bhagavan*.

4. **adhimoktavyās** Du w. *adhimoktavyāḥ*.

5. **dharmasamjñeti** Du w. *dharmasamjñā iti*. **dharmasaṁjñeti** Du w. *dharmasaṁjñā iti*. **aprameyāsaṁkhyeyāl** Chak w. *-āsaṁkhyeyā*; Du w. *-āsaṁkhyeyān*. **lokadhātūn** Chak w. *-dhatūn*.

6. **–ripūrṇān** Chak is misprinted as *-pūrṇāṅ*. **dānan** Du w. *dānaṁ*. **dadyād** Du w. *dadyāt*. **prajñāpāramitāyā** Chak w. *prajña–*.

catuṣpadikām Chak, Du w. *catuṣpādikām.* **dhārayed** Chak w. *vācayed*; Cz in his notation has been misled by Chak. **deśayet** Chak, Du w. *deśayed.* **paryavāpnuyād** Du w. *paryavāpnuyāt.*

Folio 12b

1. **tato** Cz inserts *nidānaṁ* after *tato* without noting that it is not found in G and Par. **prasavetāprameyam** Du w. *prasaveta aprayeyam.* **asaṁkhyeyaṁ** Du w. *asaṁkhyeyam.* **saṁprakā-śayet** Chak w. *samprakāśayet.* **saṁprakāśayet** Chak w. *samprakāśaye*; Du w. *saṁprakāśayed.*
2. **draṣṭavya** Du w. *draṣṭavyaṁ.* **saṁskṛtaṃ** Chak w. *saṁskṛtam.* **āttamanā** Du w. *āttamanāḥ.* **sthavira** Chak is misprinted as *sthavirasubhūtis*, etc.; Du w. *sthaviraḥ.* **sadevamānuṣāsu–** Du w. *-manuṣyā-.*
3. **samāptāḥ** Both Chak and Du have *samāptā* and it is possible that here again : is a part of the final punctuation mark; i.e., :)) ·)), instead of *-ḥ*)) ·)); cf. fo. 10b, line 6 and note.

TRANSLATION OF THE GILGIT TEXT

[5a] The Blessed One said: "The number, Subhūti, of particles of dust in a world system of three thousand great-thousand worlds[1]—is that great?"

He said: "It is great, Blessed One. That particle of dust is said to be not a particle by the Tathāgata. In that sense 'a particle of dust' is used. Also, that which is a world system, that is said by the Tathāgata not to be a system. In that sense 'world system' is used."

The Blessed One said: "What do you think, Subhūti? Is a Tathāgata to be seen through the thirty-two characteristic marks of a great man?"

He said: "No, Blessed One. Why is that? Each of the thirty-two characteristic marks of a great man is said to be not a characteristic mark by the Tathāgata. In that sense 'the thirty-two characteristic marks of a great man' is used."

The Blessed One said: "But again, Subhūti, if a woman or a man were to give away their person as many times as there are sands in the river Ganges, and if someone else, after taking from this discourse on Doctrine a verse of even four lines, were to teach it to others, the latter alone would on that account produce great merit, immeasurable and incalculable."

Then, indeed, the Venerable Subhūti, through the shock of the Doctrine,[2] burst into tears. Wiping away his tears, he said this to the Blessed One: "It is astonishing, O Blessed One, it is truly astonishing, O Sugata, how this discourse on Doctrine[3] was spoken by the Tathāgata, as a consequence of which knowledge has arisen for me! I have never heard this discourse on Doctrine before. They, Blessed One, who will produce a true conception when this sūtra is being taught here will be possessed by the greatest astonishment. And that, Blessed One, which is a true conception, that indeed is not a conception. On that account the Tathāgata says [5b] 'A true conception, a true conception'.

"Blessed One, it is not astonishing to me that I am prepared for the teaching of this discourse on Doctrine, since I have been intent upon it. Blessed One, those living beings who will take up this discourse on

Doctrine . . .[4] and master it will be possessed by the greatest astonishment. But again, Blessed One, a conception of a self will not occur to them, nor a conception of a living being, nor a conception of a personal soul, nor a conception of a person. And why is that? Because the Buddhas, the Blessed Ones, have walked away from all conceptions."

The Blessed One said: "That is so, Subhūti. Those who, after hearing this discourse on Doctrine, will not be terrified, will not tremble, will not be overcome by dread, they will be possessed by the greatest astonishment.[5] And why is that? This, Subhūti, has been declared by the Tathāgata to be the greatest perfection. And that which the Tathāgata declares the greatest perfection is declared as well by immeasurable Buddhas and Blessed Ones. In that sense 'greatest perfection' is used.

"But again, Subhūti, that which is the perfection of patience of the Tathāgata, just that is not a perfection. And why is that? When, Subhūti, an evil king[6] hacked the flesh from all my limbs, there was for me on that occasion no conception of a self, no conception of a living being, no conception of a personal soul, no conception of a person. Nor, moreover, could there have been a conception of injury for me at that time.[7] Subhūti, I remember five hundred births in the past when I was a seer who taught patience. Then too there was for me no conception of a self, no conception of a living being, no conception of a personal soul, no conception of a person. Therefore, Subhūti, a bodhisattva, a mahāsattva, having abandoned all conception . . . " [folio 6 is missing].

["Those who will take up this discourse on Doctrine, will preserve it, will declare it, will recite it, will master it . . .],[8] [7a] all those living beings will carry my awakening on their shoulder.[9] And why is that? It is not possible for this discourse on Doctrine to be heard by living beings who have but little resolve. Nor is it possible for it to be heard, taken up . . . or mastered, by those who have a view of a self, nor by those who have a view of a living being or a personal soul or a person. That situation simply does not occur.

"But again, Subhūti, on whatever piece of ground one will proclaim this sūtra, that piece of ground will become an object of worship. That piece of ground will become for the world together with its devas, men and asuras a true shrine to be revered and circumambulated.[10] Subhūti, those sons and daughters of good family who will take up sūtras such as these . . . and master them, they will be ridiculed, severely ridiculed. But, through that ridicule, their demeritorious actions in former lives which should lead to rebirth in an unfortunate destiny will here and now come to be exhausted, and they will obtain the awakening of a Buddha.[11]

"Subhūti, I remember that in the past, during incalculable and more than incalculable aeons—before the time of the Tathāgata, Arhat, Fully

and Completely Awakened One Dīpaṁkara—there were eighty-four hundreds of thousands of millions of billions of Buddhas who were attended to by me and, having been attended to, were not neglected. [7b] If, Subhūti, after having attended to them, all those Buddhas were not neglected by me; and if in the Final Period, when the last five hundred years have begun, someone will take up these sūtras ... and master them, then, Subhūti, the quantity of merit resulting from the former does not approach even a hundredth part of the quantity of merit of the latter, nor a thousandth part, nor a hundred-thousandth. That quantity of merit is not open to enumeration, nor measure, nor calculation, nor comparison, nor likening. Subhūti, those living beings, those sons and daughters of good family will acquire then such a quantity of merit that if I were to declare the quantity of merit of those sons and daughters of good family, living beings (who heard that declaration) would go mad, they would be totally disoriented. But again, Subhūti, this discourse on Doctrine is unthinkable—unthinkable indeed is its effect."[12]

He said: "How, Blessed One, should one who has set out on the way of a bodhisattva stand? How should he actually practice? How should he direct his thought?"

The Blessed One said: "Here, Subhūti, one who has set out on the way of a bodhisattva should produce a thought in this manner: 'All living beings should be led by me to final nirvana in the realm of nirvana which leaves nothing behind. But after having led living beings thus to final nirvana, there is no living being whatsoever who has been lead to final nirvana.' And why is that? If, [8a] Subhūti, a conception of a living being were to occur to a bodhisattva, a conception of a personal soul, or a conception of a person, he is not to be called 'a bodhisattva'. And why is that? Subhūti, that which is called 'one who has set out on the way of a bodhisattva', that is not a thing.[13]

"What do you think, Subhūti? Is that some thing which was awakened to by the Tathāgata, in the presence of the Tathāgata Dīpaṁkara, as the utmost, full and perfect awakening?"

He said: "Blessed One, that which was awakened to by the Tathāgata, in the presence of the Tathāgata Dīpaṁkara, as the utmost, full and perfect awakening is not some thing."

He said: "Because of that was I assured by the Tathāgata Dīpaṁkara: 'You, young man, will be at a future time a Tathāgata, Arhat, Fully and Perfectly Awakened One named Śākyamuni.' And why is that? 'Tathāgata', Subhūti, that is a designation for thusness. Subhūti, someone might speak thus, 'The utmost, full and perfect awakening is fully and perfectly awakened to by the Tathāgata.' But that which is the utmost, full and perfect awakening fully and perfectly awakened to by

the Tathāgata is not some thing. Subhūti, the thing which is fully and perfectly awakened to by the Tathāgata—in that there is neither truth nor falsehood. On that account the Tathāgata says 'all characteristics are the characteristics of a Buddha.' 'All characteristics', Subhūti, all those are not characteristics. In that sense 'all characteristics' is used. Suppose for example, Subhūti, there would be a man endowed with a body, a great body."

Subhūti said: "That which [8b] the Tathāgata has called a man endowed with a body, a great body—he, Blessed One, is said to be without a body by the Tathāgata. In that sense 'endowed with a body, a great body' is used."

The Blessed One said: "Just so, Subhūti, the bodhisattva who would speak thus: 'I will lead beings to final nirvana'—he is not to be called a bodhisattva. And why is that? Is there, Subhūti, some thing which is named 'bodhisattva'?"

He said: "No indeed, Blessed One."

The Blessed One said: "On that account the Tathāgata says 'all things are without living being, without personal soul, without person.' Subhūti, a bodhisattva who would speak thus: 'I will bring about wonderful arrangements in [my] sphere of activity'[14]—he too is not to be called a bodhisattva.[15] And why is that? 'Wonderful arrangements in [one's] sphere of activity, wonderful arrangements in [one's] sphere of activity', Subhūti, those have been said by the Tathāgata not to be wonderful arrangements. In that sense 'wonderful arrangements in [one's] sphere of activity' is used. Subhūti, that bodhisattva who is intent on saying 'without a self are things, without a self are things'—he is declared 'a bodhisattva, a bodhisattva' by the Tathāgata, Arhat, Fully and Perfectly Awakened One.

"What do you think, Subhūti? Does the physical eye of the Tathāgata exist?"

He said: "So it is Blessed One. The physical eye of the Tathāgata exists."

The Blessed One said: "What do you think, Subhūti? Does the divine eye of the Tathāgata exist, the eye of wisdom, the eye of Dharma, the awakened eye?"

He said: "So it is Blessed One. [9a] The divine eye of the Tathāgata, the eye of wisdom, the eye of Dharma, the awakened eye exists."

The Blessed One said: "What do you think, Subhūti? There could be as many Ganges rivers as there are sands in the river Ganges, and there could be as many world systems as there are sands in that many rivers. Would those world systems then be many?"[16]

The Blessed One said: "Subhūti, I could know[17] the various streams of thought of living beings as numerous as those in that many world systems. And why is that? 'Stream of thought, stream of thought', Subhūti, that has been said by the Tathāgata not to be a stream. In that sense 'stream of thought' is used. And why is that? Subhūti, a past thought is not apprehended. A future thought is not apprehended. A present (thought)[18] is not apprehended.

"What do you think, Subhūti? He who, after having filled this three thousand great-thousand world system with the seven precious things, would give it as a gift—surely that son or daughter of good family would, as a result, produce much merit?"

He said: "Much, Blessed One, much, Sugata."

The Blessed One said: "So it is, Subhūti, so it is much. That son or daughter of good family would, as a result, produce much merit. If, Subhūti, there would have been a quantity of merit, the Tathāgata would not have said 'quantity of merit, quantity of merit'.

"What do you think, Subhūti? Should the Tathāgata be seen through the perfect development of his physical body?" [9b]

He said: "No Blessed One. It is not through the perfect development of his physical body that the Tathāgata is to be seen. And why is that? 'A perfect development of the physical body, a perfect development of the physical body', that is said to be not a perfect development by the Tathāgata. In that sense 'perfect development of the physical body' is used."

The Blessed One said: "What do you think, Subhūti? Should the Tathāgata be seen through the possession of characteristic marks?"

He said: "No Blessed One. It is not through the possession of characteristic marks that the Tathāgata is to be seen. And why is that? That which is the possession of characteristic marks is said to be not the possession of characteristic marks by the Tathāgata. In that sense 'possession of characteristic marks' is used."

The Blessed One said: "What do you think, Subhūti? Surely it occurs to the Tathāgata: 'Not by me has a Doctrine been taught.' He, Subhūti, who would speak thus: 'By the Tathāgata a Doctrine has been taught,' he, Subhūti, would falsely accuse me by taking something up from what is not there.[19] Why is that? 'A teaching of Doctrine, a teaching of Doctrine', Subhūti, that is not some thing which receives the name 'a teaching of Doctrine.'"

He said: "Blessed One, will there be any living beings at a future time who, after hearing such Doctrines being taught, will believe?"

The Blessed One said: "They, Subhūti, are neither living beings nor nonliving beings. Why is that? 'All living beings', Subhūti, they are said

to be not living beings by the Tathāgata. In that sense [10a] 'all living beings' is used.

"What do you think, Subhūti? Surely that which was awakened to by the Tathāgata as the utmost, full and perfect awakening is some thing?"

He said: "Blessed One, that which was awakened to by the Tathāgata as the utmost, full and perfect awakening is not some thing."

The Blessed One said: "So it is, Subhūti, so it is. Not even the most minute thing exists or is found there. In that sense 'utmost, full and perfect awakening' is used. But again, Subhūti, that thing is the same; there is no difference. In that sense 'utmost, full and perfect awakening' is used. Through the fact of there being no personal soul, no living being, no person, that utmost, full and perfect awakening is fully and perfectly awakened to as identical with all meritorious things. 'Meritorious things, meritorious things', Subhūti—but just those are said by the Tathāgata not to be things. In that sense 'meritorious things' is used.

"But once again, Subhūti, if someone, after collecting piles of the seven precious things as large as the kings of mountains, the Sumerus, here in this three thousand great-thousand world system, were to give them as a gift; and someone else, after having taken from this Perfection of Wisdom a verse of even four lines, were to teach it to others—Subhūti, the quantity of merit from the former case does not approach a hundredth part of the quantity of merit of the latter ... [10b] it is not open to comparison.

"What do you think, Subhūti? Surely it occurs to the Tathāgata: 'living beings are released by me.' Not, again, Subhūti, is it to be seen thus. Why is that? That which is released by the Tathāgata is not some living being. If again, Subhūti, there would have been some living being who was released by the Tathāgata, that indeed would have been for him the holding on to a self, the holding on to a living being, the holding on to a personal soul, the holding on to a personal entity. 'Holding on to a self', Subhūti, this is said by the Tathāgata to be not holding on, but it is held on to by simple ordinary people. 'Simple ordinary people', Subhūti, these are said by the Tathāgata not to be people. In that sense 'simple ordinary people' is used.

"What do you think, Subhūti, should the Tathāgata be seen through the possession of characteristic marks?"

He said: "That is so, Blessed One. The Tathāgata is to be seen through the possession of characteristic marks."

The Blessed One said: "But if, Subhūti, the Tathāgata were to be seen through the possession of characteristic marks, a wheel-turning king would also be a Tathāgata."

He said: "As I understand the meaning of what was said by the Blessed One, the Tathāgata is not to be seen through the possession of characteristic marks."

Then, again, on that occasion the Blessed One spoke these verses:

Those who saw me through form,
Those who associated me with sound—[11a]
They have engaged in a misguided effort.
Those people will not see me.

The Awakened One is to be seen from the Doctrine;
The Tathāgata is the body of Doctrine;
But, indeed, the substance of the Doctrine is not
to be understood,
Nor is it possible for it to be understood.

"What do you think, Subhūti? Is the utmost, full and perfect awakening fully and perfectly awakened to by the Tathāgata through the possession of characteristic marks? Again, Subhūti, it is not to be seen thus. The utmost, full and perfect awakening, Subhūti, is not fully and perfectly awakened to by the Tathāgata through the possession of characteristic marks.

"If, again, Subhūti, it should occur thus: 'by someone set out on the way of a bodhisattva the destruction of some thing is taught, or its annihilation,' again, Subhūti, it is not to be seen thus. The destruction of some thing, or its annihilation, is not taught by someone who has set out on the way of a bodhisattva.

"If, again, Subhūti, a son or daughter of good family, after filling world systems similar in number to the sands of the Ganges with the seven precious things, were to give them as a gift to the Tathāgata, Arhat, Fully and Perfectly Awakened One; and if a bodhisattva were to achieve composure[20] in the midst of things that have no self—the latter would indeed produce much greater merit than the former. However, Subhūti, a quantity of merit is not to be acquired by a bodhisattva."

He said: "A quantity of merit, Blessed One, is to be acquired, surely?"

The Blessed One said: "'Is to be acquired', Subhūti, not 'is to be held on to'. In that sense 'is to be acquired' is used. [11b]

"But once again, Subhūti, if someone were to speak thus: 'The Tathāgata goes, or he comes, or he stands, or he sits, or he lays down'—he does not understand the meaning of what I said. Why is that? A 'Tathāgata', Subhūti, has not come from anywhere, has not gone

anywhere. In that sense 'Tathāgata, Arhat, Fully and Perfectly Awakened One' is used.

"And if again, Subhūti, a son or daughter of good family were to grind into powder as many world systems as there are particles of dust in this three thousand great-thousand world system so that there would be just a pile of the finest atoms—what do think, Subhūti? Would that pile of atoms be huge?"

He said: "That is so, Blessed One, that would be a huge pile of atoms. And why is that? If, Blessed One, there would have been a pile, the Blessed One would not have said 'a pile of atoms'. Why is that? That which is said to be a pile of atoms, that is said by the Blessed One not to be a pile. In that sense 'a pile of atoms' is used. That which the Tathāgata calls 'three thousand great-thousand world system', that is said by the Tathāgata not to be a system. In that sense 'three thousand great-thousand world system' is used. Why is that? If, Blessed One, there would have been a system, just that, Blessed One, would have been the holding on to a solid mass. And that which is said by the Tathāgata [12a] to be the holding on to a solid mass is said to be not holding on. In that sense 'holding on to a solid mass' is used."

The Blessed One said: "And holding on to a solid mass is itself, Subhūti, a thing not open to verbal expression; it cannot be put into words. It, however, has been held on to by simple ordinary people. Why is that? If, Subhūti, someone were to speak thus 'A view of a self was taught by the Tathāgata, a view of a living being, a view of a personal soul, a view of a person'—would he indeed, Subhūti, speak correctly?"

He said: "No, Blessed One. And why is that? Blessed One, that which is said by the Tathāgata to be a view of a self, that is said by the Tathāgata to be not a view. In that sense 'a view of a self' is used."

The Blessed One said: "In this way, Subhūti, one who has set out on the way of a bodhisattva should know all things, should be intent on them. And he should be intent on them in such a way that even the conception of a thing would not be present. Why is that? 'Conception of a thing, conception of a thing', Subhūti, that is said by the Tathāgata not to be a conception. In that sense 'conception of a thing' is used.

"And again, Subhūti, if a bodhisattva, mahāsattva, having filled immeasurable, incalculable world systems with the seven precious things, were to give them as a gift; and if a son or daughter of good family, having taken up from this Perfection of Wisdom a verse of even four lines, were to preserve it, were to teach it, were to master it [12b]—the latter certainly would produce immeasurable, incalculable merit, much greater than the first.

"And how would he fully cause it to appear? In such a way that he would not cause it to appear. In that sense 'fully cause it to appear' is used."

A shooting star, a fault of vision, a lamp;
An illusion and dew and a bubble;
A dream, a flash of lightning, a thunder cloud—
In this way is the conditioned to be seen.

The Blessed One said this.

Delighted, the Elder Subhūti, and the monks and nuns, the lay men and women, and the world with its devas, men, asuras and gandharvas rejoiced in that spoken by the Blessed One.

The Vajracchedikā Prajñāparamitā is concluded.

NOTES

For complete citation information the reader is directed to the list of abbreviations and bibliography found at the beginning of Part II.

Notes to the Introduction

1. Chakravarti 1956: 177.
2. Conze 1974: 1.
3. Conze 1974: 6.
4. Conze 1974: 6, 48.
5. Yuyama 1967: 68.

Notes to the Translation

1. "Three thousand great-thousand worlds" is, of course, hardly acceptable English but, as Franklin Edgerton points out, "It is not clear what precise meaning, if any, attaches to mahāsāhasra." He also notes that "in Mahāvyutpatti 7999 ff. and Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa 343.16 ff. mahā- compounded with other numbers means ten times the number," and the same may or may not be intended here (see BHSD 259). For at least one description of what a world system so described would include, see La Vallée Poussin 1923–31: II.170.
2. To appreciate the significance of the expression *dharmapravegena*, "through the shock of the Doctrine," and of this passage as a whole, see the short but important paper by Ananda Coomaraswamy 1977 and the passages from Pāli literature he cites there. Unless I am mistaken, this is an important passage in the *Vajracchedikā*. Its articulation of a particular kind of "emotively" charged experience (Subhūti "bursts into tears"), a kind of shock-induced realization as a reaction to a certain form of doctrinal expression (Subhūti says "through this discourse on Doctrine knowledge has arisen for me"), may in fact be a prototype and paradigm for at least certain strands of the later Buddhist tradition. In any case, this passage is the clearest indication we have of the kind of "religious" experience with which our text seems to have been concerned.
3. *Dharmaparyāya* is a deceptively difficult term to translate. Edward Conze, who I follow here, translates it "discourse on dharma" (Conze 1974: 76). Charles de Harlez translates it "cours de la loi" (de Harlez 1891: 471) and Max Walleser "Lehrbuch"

(Walleser 1914: 147). Edgerton says "lit. device, means of (teaching) the doctrine, and so, secondarily, religious discourse" (BHSD 279). In usage it seems to indicate first a talk or discussion or even "sermon" on the doctrine which draws out or elaborates on the meaning of the latter. Were it not for fear of possible misunderstandings, I would almost prefer to translate it as "development of the Doctrine"; that is, "development" in the sense of "to lay open by degrees or in detail, to disclose, reveal; to unfold more completely, to evolve the possibilities of" (as defined in *Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary*, s.v. develop). Secondarily, then, it comes to mean the record of that "talk" which "lays open by degrees"; that is to say, a "text" or even a "book" which contains it.

4. The marks of ellipsis in this type of sentence translate the Buddhist Sanskrit idiom *yāvat*, which stands for omitted elements of a standard list or formula. Here the whole phrase would be: "will take up this discourse on Doctrine, will preserve it, will declare it, will recite it, will master it"—editors.

5. This passage is one example of a very frequent, very important, and very little studied kind of passage found throughout the *Prajñāpāramitā* literature. Again and again the absence of fear, terror, dread and anxiety when confronted with the assertions made in these texts is defined as *the* Perfection of Wisdom, as the mark of one who actually practices the Perfection of Wisdom, or—as here—the "greatest perfection". Typical of these passages is the following from the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā*. Here, after the Buddha has exhorted Subhūti to teach the Perfection of Wisdom to bodhisattvas, Subhūti responds by saying: "'Bodhisattva, bodhisattva', when this is said, to what thing does that designation 'bodhisattva' refer? I do not see a thing called 'bodhisattva'. Nor, moreover, do I see a thing named 'the Perfection of Wisdom'. I, not finding then, O Blessed One, a bodhisattva nor a thing called bodhisattva, not apprehending, not seeing it, and not finding a Perfection of Wisdom, not apprehending, not seeing it—what bodhisattva in what Perfection of Wisdom will I teach and instruct?" (*bodhisattvo bodhisattva iti yad idaṁ bhagavann ucyate, katamasyaitad bhagavan dharmasyādhivacanaṁ yad uta bodhisattva iti. nāhaṁ bhagavaṁs taṁ dharmaṁ samanupaśyāmi yad uta bodhisattva iti. tam apy ahaṁ bhagavan dharmaṁ na samanupaśyāmi yad uta prajñāpāramitā nāma. so 'haṁ bhagavan bodhisattvaṁ vā bodhisattvadharmaṁ vā avindan anupalabhamāno 'samanupaśyan prajñāpāramitām apy avindan anupalabhamāno 'samanupaśyan katamaṁ bodhisattvaṁ katamasyāṁ prajñāpāramitāyām avavadiṣyāmi anuśāsiṣyāmi*). After this passage, however, the text immediately adds: "But again, Blessed One, if when this is being said, taught and explained the mind of a bodhisattva is not depressed, not cowed, not dejected, does not fall into despair; if he is not discouraged, not crushed; if he is not terrified, frightened, does not tremble with fear—then just this bodhisattva, mahāsattva, is to be instructed in the Perfection of Wisdom. Just this is to be known as the Perfection of Wisdom of that bodhisattva. This is the instruction in the Perfection of Wisdom" (*api tu khalu punar bhagavan saced evaṁ bhāṣyamāṇe deśyamāne upadiśyamāne bodhisattvasya cittaṁ nāvalīyate na saṁlīyate na viṣīdati na viṣādam āpadyate nāsya vipṛṣṭhībhavati mānasam na bhagnapṛṣṭhībhavati nottrasyati na saṁtrasyati na saṁtrāsam āpadyate, eṣa eva bodhisattvo mahāsattvaḥ prajñāpāramitāyām anuśāsanīyaḥ, eṣaivāsya bodhisattvasya mahāsattvasya prajñāpāramitā veditavyā, eṣo 'vavādaḥ prajñāpāramitāyām*). The text is from Vaidya 1960: 3.5ff.

Similar passages, variations on this same theme, occur throughout the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* (4.21, 5.24, 9.10, 11.2, 13.15, 15.28, etc.) but are by no means limited to this text. We find, for example, the following in the *Aṣṭādaśasāhasrikā*: "If again, Subhūti, the mind of a bodhisattva, mahāsattva, is not depressed when the fact of the isolation of all things is being talked about, is not cowed and does not tremble in fear, that bodhisattva, mahāsattva, moves in the Perfection of Wisdom" (Conze 1962: 61; see also 23.6, 60.21, etc.). In the *Saptaśatikā* we find: "Then Mañjuśrī, the heir apparent, said this to the Blessed One: 'Blessed One, just as Buddhas are those

bodhisattvas, mahāsattvas, to be seen who, after hearing this explanation of the Perfection of Wisdom, will be intent, will not be terrified, will not be frightened, will not tremble with fear" (Masuda 1930: 215.5; also 209.1, 211.4, 214.6, 214.11, 216.1, 6, 13; 217.4, 10, etc.). This repeated emphasis on fear, terror or dread in connection with hearing the Perfection of Wisdom being taught or explained would seem to indicate that the authors of our texts were clearly aware of the fact that what they were presenting was above all else potentially terrifying and awful, and that a predictable reaction to it was fear. And, although these passages need to be studied further, they already give us some valuable information on the nature of the experience with which this literature is dealing.

6. Conze does not question the reading *kaliṅga-rājā*, "the king of Kaliṅga," but the reading of the Gilgit text and the Khotanese *(Kalärri)* = *Kalirājaḥ* would seem to further confirm Edgerton's suggestion that *kaliṅga-rājan* "is undoubtedly an error of the tradition for *kali-rājan"* (BHSD 172).

7. It is possible that we have here in the Gilgit text a scribal omission. Pargiter's text (paragraph 9a) has: nāsī me tasmiṁ samaye [ātma]-(saṁjñā vā satva-jīva-pudgala-saṁ)jñā vā *na me kāci saṁjñā nāsaṁjñā babhūva (ta)*[*t kasya hetoḥ sa*] *cen me subhūte tasmiṁ sa(maye) ā(tmasam)jñābhaviṣyat vyāpādasaṁjñā me tasmiṁ samaye 'bhaviṣya(t)* [xxxxxx *saṁ*] *jñā pudgalasaṁjñābhaviṣya*[*t* vyā]pādasaṁjñā me tasmiṁ samaye 'bhaviṣyat. But all of that which appears in italics does not occur in the Gilgit text. This, of course, looks very much like a homoeoteleuton in which the scribe may have written the first *pudgalasaṁjñā*, then, through an eye skip, he may have written after the first *pudgalasaṁjñā* what should have come after the second *pudgalasaṁjñā*, thereby omitting everything that should have come between. This kind of homoeoteleuton is in fact frequently found in the Gilgit manuscripts. Against this, however, is the fact that if this was purely a "mechanical" omission we would have expected the Gilgit text to have *–pudgalasaṁjñā vā 'bhaviṣyat vyāpādasaṁjñā me tasmin*, etc. But instead we find *pudgalasaṁjñā vā vyāpādasaṁjñā vāpi me tasmin*, etc., and the *vāpi* is particularly hard to explain. I see no way of deciding the case. If, however, the Gilgit text is not to be explained as the result of a scribal omission, then it must at least be noted that the way in which it has constructed the conditional sentence is rather unusual (cf. Aalto 1968).

8. The passage enclosed in brackets is translated from Pargiter's edition.

9. The implied equation the *Vajracchedikā* makes here between preserving some form of the Doctrine and preserving the awakening (*bodhi*) of the Buddha is more explicitly stated elsewhere in the *Prajñāpāramitā* literature. In the Gilgit manuscript of the *Aṣṭādaśasāhasrikā*, for example, the Buddha is made to say: "Ananda, whatsoever son or daughter of good family will take up this deep Perfection of Wisdom, will preserve it, recite and master it, by him the awakening of the past, present and future Buddhas, Blessed Ones, will be preserved" (*yo hi kaścid ānanda kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā imāṁ gaṁbhīrāṁ prajñāpāramitām udgrahīṣyati dhārayiṣyati vācayiṣyati paryavāpsyaty atītānāgatapratyutpannānāṁ buddhānāṁ bhagavatāṁ tena bodhir dhāritā bhaviṣyati*) (Conze 1962: 75.16). And the same thing, in slightly different words, is said a little later in the same text (84.14). There remains, however, the problem of whether we have here in the *Vajracchedikā* a figure of speech or a reference to an actual practice. Bearing in mind that the term *dharmaparyāya* can mean both "a discourse on the Doctrine" and the text that contains it, is our passage saying that "he who preserves this *dharmaparyāya* will carry the Awakening of the Buddha" (i.e., the text of the *dharmaparyāya*) on his shoulder in a literal sense, in the sense that he will carry an actual book containing the "awakening" on his shoulder? Or is it saying simply that he who preserves the *dharmaparyāya* will honor the "Awakening of the Buddha," the phrase "carry it on his shoulder" being used figuratively to indicate that he shows it respect? We have

in fact the same problem in a number of other passages in Mahāyāna sūtra literature.

In the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, for example, we find the following verse (III.147): *tathāgatasya yatha dhātu dhārayet tathaiva yo mārgati koci taṁ naraḥ / evam eva yo mārgati sūtram īdṛśaṁ labhitva ca mūrdhani dhārayeta* (Kern and Nanjio 1908–12: 99.1–2). And, although the construction here is a little strange, the sense of this verse would seem to be: "As some man who searches for it would thus preserve a relic of the Tathāgata, just so, he who searches for such a sūtra, after having obtained it, would carry it on his head." "Would carry on his head" is, of course, the literal meaning of *mūrdhani dhārayeta*. The problem is that the dictionaries give the meaning of *mūrdhanā* or *mūrdhani*, *śirasā* or *śirasi dhārayati*, as "to bear on the head" and "honor highly"; that is to say that the phrase can have either a literal or a figurative meaning.

A similar problem arises in connection with a passage in the *Saptaśatikā*. Here we find: *avinivartanīyabhūmau tvaṁ śāradvatīputra pratiṣṭhitāṁs tān kulaputrān kuladuhitṝṁ jānīṣva ya imaṁ prajñāpāramitānirdeśaṁ śrutvādhimokṣyante nottrasiṣyanti na santrasiṣyanti na santrāsam āpatsyante mūrdhnā ca pratigrahīṣyanti* (Masuda 1930: 216.11), which Conze translates: "Śāradvatīputra ... you should know that those sons and daughters of good family are established on the irreversible stage, if, on hearing this exposition of perfect wisdom, they believe, do not tremble, are not frightened or terrified, and if they accept it, placing it on their heads as a mark of respect" (Conze 1973: 86). What Conze rather ingeniously translates "and if they accept it, placing it on their heads as a mark of respect" is *mūrdhnā ca pratigrahīṣyanti* (the Tibetan here, as in the above passage from the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, is *spyi bos len pa*), and this is only a variant of the expression *śirasā pratigṛhṇāti*, which the dictionaries give as "to receive, accept ... 'with the head'; i.e., 'humbly, obediently.'" Again, the phrase is open to both a literal and a figurative interpretation. Conze, of course, gives a translation which tries to reflect both meanings and, although it is difficult, if not impossible, to decide here, there are passages where the figurative meaning seems to be more clearly excluded. One such passage is found in the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*: *tatas tathāgataṁ so 'ṁsena pariharati ya imaṁ dharmaparyāyaṁ pustakagataṁ kṛtvāṁsena pariharati* (338.4) ("Then, he carries the Tathāgata on his shoulder, who, after making this discourse on the Doctrine into a book, carries it on his shoulder.") Here, in light of the specific mention of an actual book, it is difficult to take this passage in a figurative sense. It in fact seems to be referring to an actual practice, and we may have another reference to this practice in the much later *Biography of Dharmasvāmin* in which we read: "When the Guru Dharmasvāmin visited the Vajrāsana-saṅgha-vihāra carrying an Indian manuscript of the *Ashṭasāhasrikā-Prajñāpāramitā*, the keeper, a Śrāvaka, enquired, 'What book is it?' The Dharmasvāmin answered that it was the Prajñāpāramitā. The Śrāvaka said, 'You seem to be a good monk, but this carrying on your back of a Mahāyāna book is not good. Throw it into the river!'" (*rdo rje gdan dge 'dun gyi gtsug lag khang shes bya bar bla ma chos rjes brgyad stong pa'i rgya dpe gcig khur nas byon pas dkon gnyer nyan thos shig na re chos ci yin zer / chos rjes prajñā pa ra mi ta ho shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa yin gsung pas de na re khyod dge slong legs po cig 'dug pa la theg pa chen po'i chos rgyab tu khur ba de ma legs de bor la chu la gyur cig zer nas*) (Roerich 1959: 18–19 and 73–74). Note that in his translation after "an Indian manuscript" Roerich gives a note citing the Tibetan as *rgya-dpe-rgya-gar-gyi-dpe-cha*, but his edition has only *rgya dpe*.

The point of all this is that, although these and similar passages must be much more fully studied, our passage in the *Vajracchedikā*, when read in light of these other passages, appears to be potentially much more than a simple figure of speech. It may in fact refer to the actual practice of carrying sacred books on one's person.

10. On this passage and a number of parallel passages elsewhere see Schopen 1975. I would here like to make amends for having overlooked in my discussion some interesting remarks of the late Professor Conze in regard to this formula: "In this context the *Prajñāpāramitā* is then invested with a kind of magical power. It sanctifies the place where it is, makes it into a sacred, a holy place. 'This perfection of wisdom makes a spot of earth into a holy place for beings, worthy of being worshipped and revered' [translating *Aṣṭa* iii 57]" (see Conze 1948: esp. 119).

11. I know of no exact parallels in Mahāyāna sūtra literature to this interesting passage, but the idea expressed here—that unmeritorious karma could be eliminated as a result of being abused by others for having adopted a particular practice or position—is remarkably close to a set of ideas and practices associated with the Pāśupatas. See Ingalls 1962 and Hara 1967-68. Professor Hara, for example, cites the following passage from the *Pāśupata-sūtra* attributed to Lakulīṣa: *avamataḥ sarvabhūteṣu paribhūyamānaś caret, apahata-pāpmā pareṣāṁ parivādāt, pāpaṁ ca tebhyo dadāti sukṛtaṁ ca teṣām ādatte* ("Dishonoured amongst all beings, ill-treated he should wander. [He thus becomes] freed of evil because of the slander of others. He gives his bad karma to them. And he takes their good karma" [408]). Our passage in the *Vajracchedikā*, of course, does not specifically mention an actual transfer between the abused and the abuser; in fact it gives no indication of the mechanism or process by which the "bad karma" of the abused is actually eliminated. In spite of this, the basic idea here appears, as I have said, to be remarkably close to the basic idea found in the *Pāśupata-sūtra*. See also Hara 1970. For the history of the Pāśupatas see the summary in the last chapter of Lorenzen 1972: 173–92. It should perhaps be noted that Jean Filliozat has called into question Professor Hara's interpretation of the "Transfer of Merit" in Pāśupata sources (see Filliozat 1980: 111).

12. Conze in his edition cites a number of "parallels" for this passage: *Divyāvadāna* (Cowell and Neil ed.), 78, 469; *Mahāvaṁsa* (Geiger ed.): XVII, 56; XXXI, 125; and *Karmavibhaṅgopadeśa* (Lévi ed.), 153.14 and n. 4, etc. To these I would add only Waldschmidt 1967: 426–27. The interesting point here, however, is that our passage in the *Vajracchedikā* is not strictly speaking "parallel" with these other passages, all of which, first of all, are in verse. Typical of these verse passages is *Divyāvadāna* 79: *evaṁ hy acintiyā buddhā buddhadharmā 'py acintiyā / acintiye prasannānāṁ vipāko 'pi acintiyaḥ //* ("Thus indeed the Buddhas are unthinkable, unthinkable too are the characteristics of a Buddha. Of those having faith in the unthinkable, surely then unthinkable is the effect.")

Seen in light of these "parallel" passages it would seem that the author of the *Vajracchedikā* is playing on an old formula. He gives the old formula new meaning by introducing a significant substitution, while retaining the basic statement. He substitutes *dharmaparyāya*, "this Discourse on the Doctrine" or the "text" that contains it, for the "Buddha" of the old formula, and thereby establishes, for the "reader" familiar with the formula, the equation of the two.

13. The reader will have observed that I have so far not left the word *dharma* untranslated, and have, in fact, tried to translate it throughout. *Dharma* is, of course, a notoriously difficult term to translate, and this fact has been taken as the justification for not translating it at all. But I do not think this gets us very far. In our text the term has at least two basic meanings, and in light of this I have used two renderings. When the term is used to refer primarily to "teachings" or something taught, as in *dharmaparyāya*, I have consistently translated it by "Doctrine." When it is used in a more "philosophical" sense as an element in assertions regarding "reality," I have consistently translated it by "thing," an English term of equal richness, intending thereby the sense "whatever exists, or is conceived to exist, as a separate entity; any separable or distinguishable object of thought" (*Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary*, 883). On this aspect of the term see most recently Warder 1971. This, of course, does not differ radically from the way in which Max Müller

handled the term in the first English translation of the Sanskrit text of the *Vajracchedikā*. But, for example, where he would translate "nothing," I would prefer "no thing," the two having quite different senses in English. There is at least one place in our text, the compound *dharmacakṣu*, where I do not know exactly which of the two basic meanings of *dharma* is supposed to be in play. As a consequence, in this case I leave the term untranslated. There is also one place in our text where the term appears to be used in a third basic sense—*sarvadharmā buddhadharmā iti*, etc., at 8a6—and here I have translated it by "characteristics."

14. "'Wonderful arrangements' in [my] sphere of activity" translates *kṣetravyūha*, which presumably stands for *buddhakṣetravyūha*. Here the text appears to be referring to the idea that the bodhisattva—as an integral part of his long career—should work towards effecting through his accumulation of merit the appearance of a "world," a sphere, which is ideally suited to the pursuance of the religious goal by the individuals with whom he is concerned. This idea, and the whole complex of ideas connected with the "buddhafield," has yet to be fully studied. Cf. Rowell 1934-37, Demiéville 1937 and Lamotte 1962: 395-404.

15. The text has here only *so 'pi tathaiva vaktavyaḥ* and Conze's text has the same reading. But the various manuscript traditions show some uncertainty here and Müller reads *sa vitathaṁ vadet*. Pargiter has read—and in part reconstructed—his Central Asian manuscript *vitatham evaṁ kartavyaḥ*. The Khotanese translation has *ṣi na baysūña vūysai hvañai*, which Konow translates into Sanskrit as *saḥ na bodhisattvaḥ vaktavyaḥ*. The Tibetan translation in the Peking Kanjur has *de yang de bzhin du brjod par bya'o*, but the blockprint Conze cites has *de bzhin du brjod par bya'o*. The uncertainty here seems to result from the fact that the referent of *tathaiva* is not immediately clear; this is a consequence, it would seem, of the fact that it occurs somewhat earlier. First we have *evam etat subhūte yo bodhisatva evaṁ vaded ahaṁ satvān parinirvāpayiṣyāmīti · na sa bodhisatva iti vaktavyaḥ*. This is followed by a passage giving the reason for this—a passage much longer in Conze's and Müller's text than it is in the Gilgit and Central Asian text. Then we have *yaḥ subhūte bodhisatva evaṁ vaded ahaṁ kṣetravyūhān niṣpādayiṣyāmīti · so 'pi tathaiva vaktavyaḥ*. The two passages separated by the explanatory material are clearly parallel in structure, and seen in this light it appears that *so 'pi tathaiva vaktavyaḥ* = *na sa bodhisatva iti vaktavyaḥ*; I have translated accordingly. Conze, without noting it, has done exactly the same thing.

16. After *bahavas te lokadhātavo bhaveyuḥ* virtually all the other sources have the following passage: *subhūtir āha: evam etad bhagavann evam etat sugata bahavas te lokadhātavo bhaveyuḥ*. The absence of this passage in the Gilgit text is almost certainly to be explained as a scribal omission resulting from a typical homoeoteleuton, the skip being from the first *bahavas te lokadhātavo bhaveyuḥ* to what follows the second, omitted, *bahavas te lokadhātavo bhaveyuḥ*. Note too that the mechanical nature of the omission is indicated by the fact that, unless we assume the omitted passage was originally there, the construction of the Gilgit text does not make sense. As it now stands, what is clearly a question by the "Blessed One" to Subhūti receives no answer, and the second *bhagavān āha* is completely unnecessary.

17. This is one of the very few places where the manuscript is clearly wrong. It has a second-person-singular verbal form with a first-person pronoun.

18. Presumably here a *cittaṁ* has been inadvertently omitted by the scribe.

19. The Gilgit text here is open to at least three interpretations: *asatād* may be intended as an ablative singular of a stem *asata*, an *–a* extension of a weak stem in *–t*. Such an ablative form is not, however, recorded by Edgerton. It may also be that we should read *asatā–d–udgṛhītena*, taking *–d–* as an "inorganic" sandhi consonant or "hiatus-bridger" (cf. BHSG 4.46). A third possibility is, of course, that the reading

of the Gilgit text is simply a mistake. To Conze's reference to *Dīgha-Nikāya* III.34, we might also add *Dīgha-Nikāya* III.115.

20. "Were to achieve composure" here translates *kṣāntiṁ pratilabheta*, and *kṣānti* is normally translated "patience." Conze in fact translates the phrase "would gain the patient acquiescence in." It is, however, possible that "patience" is not always the best translation for *kṣānti*, especially if "patience" is used with the implication of "to endure." As I understand the term, it more commonly means not "to endure" or "to accept" but to remain "unaffected by," and I think the present passage is a good example of this. Unless I am very much mistaken, the phrase *nirātmakeṣu dharmeṣu kṣāntiṁ pratilabheta*, which I translate as "to achieve composure in the midst of things that have no self," is intended above all else as a positive expression of the state of mind that is much more commonly expressed in negative terms, several examples of which are cited above in n. 5. That is to say, to obtain *kṣānti* is the positive expression for the same state which is negatively expressed by such formulae as "he is not depressed, not cowed, not dejected . . . he is not terrified, frightened and does not tremble with fear." But the opposite of dejection, terror and fear is not patience or endurance, it is rather something more like composure. Note too that in almost every case the absence of fear and dread and the obtainment of *kṣānti* are to take place in regard to the same basic fact, however expressed: the absence of a self. The proper reaction to this fact, and the full realization of its implications, may be expressed either positively by saying "he obtains composure in regard to it," or negatively by saying "he is not terrified, alarmed, frightened, etc." In the end they are very much the same.